

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 23, 1944

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 9, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we thank Thee for all high moments of faith when moods of doubt seem treason to that changeless world where Thou dost reign in the uninhabited realm of the excellent and the true. As another morning climbs to noon, ascending the hill of the Lord may we breathe the purer air above the dusty plains of the trivial and the temporary. Here finding an altar of pardon and peace may the memory of Thy past mercies mingle like sweet incense with a strengthening assurance of Thy present nearness which no malignity nor cruel violence of man's devising can snatch from those whose minds are stayed on Thee.

Make this ancient Chamber of our national life a place of vision, a lighthouse of hope above the raging floods of human disaster and distress. Make us the architects of a new order for peace and justice for men in all the earth. Send us forth to waiting tasks grateful for a great heritage worth living and dying for and with a deathless cause that no weapon that has been formed can defeat. In Thy might lift up our hearts and make us strong. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Saturday, May 20, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 683) to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1029) to provide for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 1758) to amend section 451 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DOUGHTON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DINGELL,

Mr. REED of New York, and Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4204) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. RABAUT, Mr. KERR, Mr. HARE, Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois, Mr. CARTER, Mr. STEFAN, and Mr. JONES were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4646) to provide for simplification of the individual income tax.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4624) to consolidate and revise the laws relating to the Public Health Service, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 254. An act for the relief of Edward Gillam; and

S. 1771. An act authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ordnance manufacturing and production facilities, and for other purposes.

SELECTIVE SERVICE RECLASSIFICATION OF LEGISLATIVE EMPLOYEES—MEETING OF LEGISLATIVE DEFERMENT COMMITTEE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, in order that Members of the Congress may be fully apprised of the new regulations and rules promulgated by the Selective Service, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record following my few remarks a copy of the orders which have been sent to us by the Joint Committee on the Deferment of Legislative Employees.

I may further say that the committee is to meet on Thursday for the benefit of Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

There being no objection, the order was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following procedure is established in accordance with the terms of Selective Service Local Board Memorandum No. 115, as amended under date of May 12, 1944:

"In the case of registrants' ages 30 through 37 the Senator or Representative is authorized to file with this committee for transmittal to the local board, using Selective Service Form 42, the information necessary for the local board to reclassify the employee whose induction is imminent and who is engaged in an essential activity, into classes II-A or II-2.

"Under the revised policy of the National Selective Service liberalizing the reclassification of men 30 years or over who are engaged in an activity in support of the national health, safety, or interest, even the replace-

able, it is believed proper for the Joint Committee for Deferment of Legislative Employees to file requests for legislative employees who meet these liberalized requirements.

"Therefore, if any Senator or Representative has in his office or committee men 30 years or over and for whom reclassification is desired, it is suggested that you furnish the Joint Committee for Deferment of Legislative Employees the names, ages, local board, and addresses, together with occupational status, and a statement in your opinion that the individual for whom application is made is contributing to the national health, safety, and interest to warrant reclassification."

EXHIBIT BY ARMY SERVICE FORCES OF CAPTURED ENEMY WEAPONS, TOGETHER WITH AMERICAN COUNTERPARTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the Army Service Forces, in conjunction with the Treasury, is presenting an exhibit of captured enemy weapons, equipment, and supplies, together with their American counterparts, in West Potomac Park, beginning May 22, which was yesterday.

Tuesday and Thursday mornings were reserved for private showings for Members of the Senate. Today is Tuesday, but cars will leave the Senate Office Building at 10 o'clock Thursday morning, and will return Senators to the Capitol by 12 o'clock.

Officers of the various technical services will be present to explain the items of equipment, and a team of enlisted men has been assigned to operate the weapons in simulated fire and to demonstrate the operation of combat vehicles. I know that the time spent in observing this demonstration will be worth while; and I wish to add my own invitation and that of the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee to the invitations Senators already have received from the War Department.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING ON NOMINATION OF AMBROSE O'CONNELL TO BE ASSOCIATE JUDGE, UNITED STATES COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the appointed subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a routine public hearing has been scheduled for the 30th day of May 1944, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Ambrose O'Connell, of New York, to be associate judge of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, vice Hon. Irvine Luther Lenroot, resigned. At the hearing all persons interested in the nomination may make representations. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHY].

THE POLL TAX—VOTE OF SENATOR LANGER ON LIMITATION OF DEBATE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I received from Mr. Gay Gotham, of Chetek, Wis.,

which illustrates the fact that sometimes the votes which we cast on this floor are not accurately reported by the press. In this letter, Mr. Gotham condemns me for having voted against the limitation of debate on the anti-poll-tax bill, whereas as a matter of fact I voted for the limitation of debate.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHETEK, Wis., May 21, 1944.

WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It was with a feeling of utter disgust that I noted your vote against limitation of debate on the anti-poll-tax bill. It was certainly a well-placed slap in the face of all liberal-minded people in the great Northwest.

Fortunately your vote on this matter cannot be explained away by your fear of instituting a gag rule on the question. Because, Mr. LANGER, even to us out here in the sticks, it just doesn't hold water. Even to you that excuse should sound very thin.

It does seem a bit ironical that these boys from the poll-tax States who are fighting and dying for democracy should have the basic democratic right withheld from them and their people by Representatives of a progressive State like North Dakota.

Yours very regretfully,

GAY GOTHAM.

FIFTEENTH REPORT OF LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. Lucas) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am submitting herewith the Fifteenth Report on Lend-Lease Operations for the period ending March 31, 1944.

United Nations forces are now about to strike new and mightier blows at Nazi-occupied Europe from offensive bases in the West, the South, and the East. The fighting men of many nations have been banded together in combined operations. They are armed with the most powerful weapons that the combined resources and ingenuity of the United Nations can produce. They are ready to bring to bear their strength to continue the crushing process against the Nazis and the German war machine.

Our American forces will go into battle side by side with the men of Britain, France, Norway, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Netherlands, and our other allies. At sea, warships flying many United Nations flags will escort the fleets. In the skies, the R. A. F. will join with the United States Army Air Forces in blasting the paths for our troops and in protecting them from air attack.

For this great undertaking, the United Nations fighting partnership has been made far stronger by lend-lease and reverse lend-lease. Through lend-lease we have made certain that every man in the forces of the other United Nations who common enemy as hard as possible, goes into battle beside an American fight-

ing man has what he needs to hit the Through reverse lend-lease, the American forces have been similarly aided by our allies with everything they had that we needed.

On the eastern European front also, arms and other war supplies provided by the United States and the British Commonwealth, will continue to strengthen the Soviet Armies for the new blows that will be timed with our advances.

In the Far East and the Pacific our offensives in New Guinea, in Burma, and against the Japanese fortress islands in the central Pacific are proof that the battle for Japan is not waiting upon the successful conclusion of the battle against Nazi Germany. China is being helped to the utmost of our ability.

Decisive battles are ahead. Now, more than ever, it is vital to our own American Army and Navy and Air Forces, as well as to the forces of the other United Nations; that we continue to provide our fighting partners with the additional war supplies they need to supplement their own resources. Congress has again recognized this fact by its overwhelming vote to extend the Lend-Lease Act.

Only by uniting our full strength with the full strength of the other free peoples of the world have we moved from the defensive to the offensive, from defeats to victories. By maintaining our unity now we shall certainly achieve final victory. By continuing our unity after the war we can assure a peace in which mankind can live and work and worship in peace, freedom, and security.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 22, 1944.

COMMENTS ON THE G. I. BILL OF RIGHTS BILL AS PASSED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I desire to take this opportunity to make known to the Senate the reasons why I believe that some of the provisions of the G. I. bill of rights, S. 1767, as passed by the House, and which is now in conference, are undesirable, inequitable, and discriminatory to servicemen fighting in this war. I wish to refer particularly to the provisions of the bill relating to unemployment insurance to be found in title V of the bill, beginning on page 68.

DELIBERALIZATIONS IN HOUSE BILL

I should like to state first for the information of the Senate that the unemployment-insurance section of the G. I. bill of rights was first modeled along the lines of the provisions in a bill, S. 1545, which I introduced 6 months ago jointly with the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee and the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri. Our bill was drafted so as to assure the veteran real protection against unemployment.

We introduced this bill 6 months ago, and, finally, after many weeks of consideration of the matter by the Senate Finance Committee, the Senate on March 24 passed the G. I. bill of rights. But the provisions of the bill as passed by the House so restricts, deliberalizes, and disqualifies veterans for unemployment insurance as to make this part of

the bill a sad reflection upon the generosity of this great country. The House version of the bill has practically emasculated the Senate provisions of the bill on unemployment insurance. Instead of a bill to enable veterans to obtain unemployment insurance, the House bill reads like a bill to deny veterans unemployment benefits.

REDUCTION IN DURATION OF BENEFITS

Mr. President, the bill which the senior Senator from Georgia and the senior Senator from Missouri and I introduced in November provided that every unemployed veteran could get 52 weeks—1 year—of unemployment-insurance benefits after his return from the service if he needed the benefits for that period of time. Our bill, like the present bill, provided, of course, that if the veteran did not become unemployed—if he did not need the benefits—if he did not register at a local employment office, that he would not be eligible to receive such benefits. This provision for a maximum duration of benefits of 1 year seemed to us only fair and reasonable and was strongly endorsed and supported by the American Legion. Taking into account that many of our boys may find it difficult to readjust to civilian life after coming back from experiences which have taken them into every corner of the globe, we felt that a maximum of 1 year's protection was not too long to give our boys to readjust to normal civilian life. The G. I. bill of rights as passed by the Senate retained the maximum provision of 1 year of benefits but reduced this maximum period if the veteran had less than 7 months of service in the armed forces.

Mr. President, there are a number of comments in the nature of criticism of some of the restrictive amendments made to the G. I. bill by the House. I ask that I may be permitted to print in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the remainder of my statement.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The remainder of Mr. WAGNER's statement is as follows:

BENEFITS FOR AS LITTLE AS 9 WEEKS

I objected to the reduction in the duration of benefits which was put into the Senate bill and I still think that it is unwise. But the House version of the bill not only reduced the maximum duration of benefits from 1 year to 26 weeks, but to add insult to injury still further reduced the duration of benefits so that any veteran having less than 9 months of service will get less than the maximum benefits of 26 weeks provided. Under the House bill a veteran can get as little as only 9 weeks of unemployment benefits. What is he supposed to do after that?

Under the House bill, a veteran would be required to have over 5 months' service in order to receive merely 16 weeks of unemployment benefits. This is a more severe eligibility requirement than the laws of the 7 States which provide 16 weeks of benefits—Kentucky, Montana, North Carolina, North Dakota, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia. Under the House bill a veteran would be required to have nearly 7 months of

service in order to receive 20 weeks of unemployment benefits. This is a more severe eligibility requirement than the laws of Utah, New York, and Hawaii. In many other States the duration of benefits provided requires less service than under the harsh provisions of the House bill.

As I said, the House bill will require a serviceman to be in the armed forces for 9 months in order to be able to draw his 26 weeks of unemployment insurance, although no unemployment insurance bill ever proposed in this country that I know of makes such stringent requirements for the receipts of benefits for either veterans or civilians. In brief, this provision in the bill is so restrictive and so lacking in generosity for our servicemen as to be a snare and a delusion when our fighting men return home.

BENEFITS SHOULD BE FOR 1 YEAR

In this connection I should like to repeat what I said to the Senate on February 15 when at that time I criticized such a provision for the variable and restricted duration of benefits:

I am of the firm conviction that every serviceman should be entitled to receive the same amount of benefits, for the same maximum period of time if he is unemployed. When a serviceman goes into the armed forces—whether for a day, or a week, or a month, or a year—he severs his ties with his family, his community, and his employer. If when he returns he cannot find a suitable job, in the light of both his past experience and his experience in the service, I think he should be entitled to unemployment compensation for at least 1 year if he is unemployed.

It must be kept in mind that if he isn't unemployed he does not get the benefits. But if he is unemployed I think the serviceman and his family are entitled to adequate protection irrespective of the length of his military service. We know that the length of a person's service in the armed forces is in most cases a factor over which the individual has little or no control. For instance, in this war a man may serve a short period of time in some special or technical capacity in a particular campaign and become injured. Although his injury may be physically minor and he may recover very quickly it may alter his entire employment opportunities. In such a case he may remain unemployed for a considerable period of time and I think he should be entitled to the maximum duration of the benefit provided in the bill. He served his country to the best of his ability—that is the important fact—and he is unemployed because of his service.

I urge the Senate conferees to make every effort to restore 1 year's protection to our servicemen so that we can say that we truly are concerned with the human aspects of demobilization.

DISQUALIFICATION OF VETERANS

Another portion of the unemployment insurance provisions of the House bill to which I take strong exception deals with the double penalties disqualifying servicemen from receiving their unemployment insurance benefits in certain situations. Of course, provisions which prevent the payments of benefits to individuals whose unemployment is due to conditions within their own control are a necessary part of any unemployment compensation plan, and S. 1767 contains

such provisions. All State and Federal unemployment compensation laws, and those of foreign countries, guard against the payment of benefits to individuals who are out of work because they have refused, without good cause, to accept a reasonable offer of suitable work, or have left their jobs of their own will, or have been discharged for misconduct. Such provisions, however, should not be so harsh and restrictive as in the House bill so as to subvert completely the purpose of the legislation and to limit the rights and freedom which the veterans of this war have fought to protect. However, the disqualification provisions included on pages 71 and 72 of the bill are so unfair—so severe and restrictive as to require complete deletion in my opinion. These provisions are more restrictive than the present unemployment insurance laws of most States. They are inconsistent with the purpose of the bill, which is to assure protection to veterans whose unemployment is involuntary. They will create ill feeling and resentment when veterans find themselves penalized and denied the protection they have been expecting to get.

VETERAN DISQUALIFIED FOR TRYING TO GET NEW JOB

Under the bill, a veteran who voluntarily leaves a job without good cause may be denied benefits for 3 to 4 additional weeks immediately thereafter. In addition to postponing his benefits for this period, the total amount of benefits to which he is entitled is also reduced by the number of weeks of disqualification. To illustrate the unfortunate effects of this latter provision, let us consider the situation of a veteran, perhaps a young man whom any of us may know, who is entitled to only 3 remaining weeks to draw benefits because of long previous unemployment covered by allowances. Let us also assume that he left a temporary job to try to get a better job, or that he left his first job to be nearer his family. Under the House version of the bill, if some State official or clerk found, under the provisions of State law, that the veteran did not have good cause for leaving he could be disqualified from receiving any Federal unemployment benefits for a 3-week period, and, on top of that, would be denied all further benefits because the remaining 3 weeks of his eligibility period would be canceled.

The unemployment-compensation laws of 32 States contain no provisions for such cancelation of benefit rights. Moreover, the District of Columbia unemployment-compensation law and the railroad unemployment-insurance law, enacted by Congress, contain no precedent for such a double-penalty provision.

This provision really raises the vital question whether veterans should be encouraged, rather than penalized, when they seek that job which will enable them to make a greater contribution to our national output, or which the veteran thinks offers him a better opportunity. This provision really limits unduly the cherished American right to leave one job in order to take a better

one—better for the veteran, for the community, and for the Nation.

S. 1767 contains an additional penalty for the veteran who leaves his job voluntarily by providing, in cases where such an occurrence is repeated, that no benefits whatsoever shall be payable to him until he shall have had 2 weeks of substantially full-time work or for such greater period of employment up to 4 weeks as the Administrator may prescribe. However, if he is unable to obtain such employment because no jobs are available in his occupation or his community, the House amendment provides that he cannot obtain one single, solitary cent of further benefits under this program.

No such penalties as the requirement of reemployment in cases of voluntary quitting are found in 44 of the existing State laws.

On the surface it may appear proper to assign a heavier disqualification to a person who quits several jobs in succession. Such a rule, however, is completely inapplicable to veterans. I strongly believe that a veteran who may have undergone the hardships of military life for 4 or 5 years, should not be denied the fair protection of this program if he finds it difficult to settle down on the first job or jobs he happens to accept after returning to civilian life. Such a penalty could have the effect of eliminating many veterans from all protection under the law.

We are all aware that many veterans, by reason of their military service, with its risks, and mental, physical, and emotional strains, will have great difficulty in adjusting themselves to civilian life and quickly settling down to regular jobs. After the hardships of 2, 3, or even 5 years of military life, in surroundings, completely different from those of their former civilian existence, they may well require some time to adjust to permanent employment. In my opinion, they should not be discouraged if they wish to try their hands at several types of work, either jobs similar to their previous civilian work, or jobs which will use the skills and experience gained while in the armed forces, or something completely different from either. The seriousness of the problems of personal readjustment is recognized by the War Manpower Commission, which has exempted veterans of the present war from all existing restrictions imposed on civilians as to the type of jobs they may take, and as to their freedom in making job changes during the first 60 days following their discharge from the armed forces.

DOUBLE PENALTIES FOR MISCONDUCT

Another ground for disqualification in this and other unemployment-compensation laws, is discharge for misconduct. This disqualification is commonly applied to individuals who have been dismissed from their jobs for violations of company rules regarding such things as tardiness or absence without excuse, smoking on the job, quarreling with a supervisor or fellow worker, and the like. The House bill provides for the same heavy disqualification penalties to be applied in such cases as are applied in cases

of voluntarily leaving work. While the criticisms I have already outlined also apply to the disqualification for misconduct, there are additional considerations which require attention.

Twenty-seven State laws, including that of the District of Columbia, have no provision for cancellation of benefit rights in cases of discharge for misconduct such as is provided by the House amendment. In addition, not one single solitary State law requires that a claimant, so discharged, must remain disqualified until he has been reemployed as the House bill requires.

Such severe disqualification provisions are especially undesirable in the case of veterans. We know that the ex-serviceman will not find it easy to adjust himself to the variety of rules, regulations, and working practices of civilian commercial and industrial establishments. Every new worker, whether he is a civilian or a veteran, has some difficulty in learning to live under the rules which govern his conduct in a modern department store or factory, although many such rules are intended for his own safety and protection. Relieved from the severe discipline of the armed forces, many veterans will not accept at once the host of company rules which they are expected to follow in their first civilian jobs. It is obvious that a veteran who is discharged for violation of rules governing smoking on the job, for example, will suffer a severe penalty in the fact of the discharge itself, since it will leave him without a job and require him to seek other employment. It seems to me that disqualification for a period of 3 to 4 weeks will prevent abuse of the unemployment allowance system. To go further and cancel the veteran's benefit rights would impose a penalty out of all proportion to his offense.

DOUBLE PENALTY WHERE VETERAN REFUSES FIRST JOB OFFERED HIM

There is still one more disqualification. That is the penalty for refusal of suitable work to which a veteran is referred under regulations of the Administrator, page 70, lines 8 to 11. Under the bill, this offense results in a 3- to 4-week disqualification, plus further loss of benefit rights until the veteran has worked 2 weeks or up to 4 weeks as prescribed by the Administrator. The severity of this latter requirement is matched by only 3 of the 51 State unemployment compensation laws.

I firmly believe that we should not pay benefits to individuals who are out of work because they have refused to accept suitable work without a good and justifiable reason. This is a genuine unemployment allowance, not a haven for the shiftless or the "goldbricker." At the same time, however, the penalty should be adapted to the problems at hand. Members of the Senate will agree, after consideration, that in determining what is suitable civilian work for a veteran of Tarawa or Cassino, possibly discharged with a slight physical disability, and what is good cause for refusing such work, we must not apply the rigid standards we have used in the past. Work in the veteran's pre-war occupation may not be suitable for him today because he

may have learned new skills while in military service. Many a former retail clerk will come out of the war a skilled machinist, radio or television mechanic, airplane pilot or truck driver; he may have picked up some practical engineering experience, or developed qualities of leadership which would fit him for administrative or executive responsibilities.

A messenger boy's job would not be suitable for an ex-messenger who comes out of the war a captain in a paratroop battalion. A former architect or lawyer might have spent his military career as a stock clerk in an Army warehouse. A job as a stock clerk would not be suitable for him. Many veterans may refuse to accept jobs for reasons which may not appear entirely reasonable to local officials on the basis of rules and regulations developed over the past 8 years, but yet these reasons may be compelling to a veteran as a result of military experience. Disqualification for a stated 3-week period provides adequate protection against abuse. We should not add the further penalty which is contained in the bill that benefit rights are suspended until the veteran obtains new work. This may mean the complete denial of protection under the program to a veteran in a period when jobs are hard to find.

I am satisfied that these added penalties were transposed into this bill from a few of the most restrictive and illiberal State unemployment insurance laws, which are not typical of the main body of laws on the subject, and have no proper relation to a Federal plan of unemployment allowances for veterans. I urge the Senate conferees to delete these harsh provisions and see to it that the fair and just provisions in the Senate version be retained.

ADDITIONAL ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS

A wholly new restrictive provision has been inserted in the bill by the House; namely, the requirement that the servicemen must have been in the armed forces for 90 days or more. I believe that this requirement should not be retained in the bill. The Senate version of the bill merely required that the person "shall have been separated from active service under other than dishonorable conditions." The double requirement in the bill as it now stands that the service must be 90 days or more and that the serviceman must have been discharged under honorable conditions will result in disqualifying thousands of veterans from benefits.

While such requirements may be a reasonable prerequisite for pensions, they are not necessary for unemployment benefits, which are payable for only a short period of time. In the first place, many veterans who will have been inducted into the service during the last 3 months prior to the termination of the war are likely to be released from service soon after the war ends and they will not be eligible for unemployment compensation benefits because they have not served 90 days. Moreover, they are the persons most likely to be returned to civilian life at the very time when there is unemployment arising out of readjust-

ment to normal business activity and they, therefore, are likely to be out of a job and in addition ineligible for benefits. Such a situation seems to me inequitable and undesirable and I trust that the Senate conferees will adjust these provisions in order that the bill will not penalize those servicemen who are inducted during the last phase of our war effort.

Moreover, it is well known that a great number of persons have been inducted into the service who for one reason or another do not show the necessary aptitude, background, education, or experience to meet the high standards required by the armed forces.

In many cases the individual is perfectly well adjusted in his job in his community in civilian life but cannot fit into Army routine. Under the terms of the House bill such individuals would be disqualified from receiving benefits even though the United States Government was the cause of their breaking their previous employment relationship and thereby causing the individual to be unemployed. It is my belief that every person who has been inducted into the armed forces and who subsequently becomes unemployed after his discharge—other than under dishonorable conditions—should be entitled to unemployment benefits under the bill.

BENEFITS CANCELED

Another section added by the House to reduce the amount of benefits payable to a veteran is section 1000 (b) on page 75 of the bill. It provides that when a veteran receives unemployment benefits and subsequently, for any reason, receives educational allowances under title II of the bill the total amount of unemployment benefits received shall be deducted from the total educational allowances provided. On pages 56-57, in paragraph (7) of the education title of the bill a similar provision has been inserted which states that when any veteran receives educational allowances and subsequently, for any reason, receives unemployment benefits, any educational allowances received shall be deducted from the total unemployment benefits provided. The House provisions as now written are unduly harsh. They result in unjustly penalizing the veteran for making a perfectly proper shift from one program to another. I think that it is proper that provision be made so that unemployment benefits and the educational allowances cannot be received simultaneously. In the provisions of the bill as passed by the Senate there is a specific provision in section 1000—page 37—which covers this very point. I think, therefore, that the provision inserted by the House in section 1000 (b) appearing on page 75 is unnecessary and undesirable and should be stricken from the bill.

REDUCTION IN AMOUNT OF BENEFITS

The bill, as passed by the Senate, provided for payments of \$15 a week for a single person or \$20 a week where the claimant has a wife or \$23 a week where he has a wife and one child or \$25 a week where he has a wife and two children.

The bill as passed by the House strikes out any reference to benefits payable on basis of the dependents of the claimants and allows a flat amount to all individuals irrespective of his family circumstances.

The Senate is well aware of the fact that in all laws relating to veterans, the Congress has always taken into account the family circumstances of the veteran in pension payments. Moreover, in the educational allowances provided in title II of the bill as passed by the House the benefits take into account the family circumstances of the individual. But when it came to unemployment compensation the House struck out any reference to the dependents of the claimant, so that the married man with children will get no more than the single man will get. I strongly urge the conferees to insist upon including dependents' benefits in the final bill. We all know that it costs more for a man with a wife and child to live than a single man, and we would be flying in the face of economic facts which are evident to everyone if we refuse to include some provision for dependents' benefits in the final bill.

DISCRIMINATION IN ADMINISTRATION OF THE LAW

The bill as passed by the Senate provided for the unemployment-insurance benefits to be administered under uniform Federal standards so that there would be equity and uniformity with respect to every single man and woman who served Uncle Sam in the service. Specific provision was made so that the administration of these uniform standards could be decentralized by using existing Federal, State, and local facilities. The bill, however, as passed by the House specifically delegates certain of the vital matters affecting the rights of veterans to benefits to the States. This will result in great variation in the protection given to veterans and will cause unnecessary discrimination. I strongly urge, therefore, that the conferees consider these provisions and urge the retention of the provision found in the bill as passed by the Senate.

Section 800 (d) on page 72 of the bill provides that in determining "the suitability of work or the existence of good cause with respect to a claimant, the conditions and standards prescribed by the unemployment compensation laws of the State in which he files his claim shall govern." This section is a substitute for a section in the Senate version of the bill, page 33-34, which gave General Hines, the Administrator of Veterans Affairs, the authority to determine the standards which should apply to veterans in every part of the United States. The House version of the bill thus means that a veteran who applies for his benefits in California may be allowed to draw his benefits in California but may be disqualified from receiving benefits in another State which has more restrictive rules or regulations or local officials who are less generous. It means that the fact that a veteran served his country in north Africa, or in Italy, or in the south Pacific shall have no bearing on his rights to benefits but rather that the State in

which by chance he happens to file his claim for Federal unemployment benefits shall determine whether he shall receive such benefits or not. No provision could to my mind be farther from assuring justice, equity, or proper treatment to our soldiers, sailors, and marines than this provision which has come over to us from the House. The Senate provision in the bill should be reinserted.

DISCRIMINATION IN ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW

Section 1102 of the bill specifically provides that any claimant whose claim for his allowance has been denied shall be entitled to a fair hearing before an administrative tribunal not of the Federal Government but of the State government. The provision in the Senate bill was deleted by the House which enabled General Hines to designate other agencies other than State agencies. As the bill is now drafted the servicemen's rights to benefits would be reviewed in the first instance by the State administrative agencies thus making it almost impossible for the Veterans' Administrator to lay down uniform rules and principles in handling the thousands of cases in the individual States. This to my way of thinking is delegation run riot. We do not permit any such practice with respect to veterans' pensions and I do not think that we should inaugurate such a precedent in view of the fact that benefits provided in the bill are Federal benefits and not State benefits.

I should think that the various veterans' organizations would find it exceedingly difficult and confusing to have to inform themselves and their members of the many variations which exist in the practices of the different State review bodies. It is clear that, as the bill as now written, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs would have the power to prescribe the general procedures and rules and regulations and standards to which the administrative tribunals of the various States would have to conform. However, in view of the fact that as I have pointed out, section 800 (d) of the bill on page 72 delegates authority to use State definitions and interpretations of certain terms used in the Federal law, it seems to me that handing over the initial review of such cases to the State agency can only result in confusion to the veteran and to the veterans' organizations which safeguard the veterans' rights. It can only result in delay in the payment of benefits to the veteran. I urge the conference committee to see to it that the Senate version of the bill is retained.

LACK OF UNIFORMITY IN ADMINISTRATION

In addition to the provisions which I have mentioned above pointing out that the Senate bill has been modified to delegate specific authority to the States to interpret the provisions of the Federal law, there is an additional provision which has been included in the House bill in section 901 (a) on page 73 which provides that the benefits may not be paid at intervals prescribed by the Veterans Administrator but must vary by "intervals prescribed by the unemployment compensation law in the State in which the claim was made." I think that this

lack of uniformity in this provision and in the other provisions is highly undesirable as a matter of principle in the administration of a Federal law. But in order to show how utterly ridiculous this provision and the two previous provisions I have mentioned might become, I wish to point out to the Senate that the bill provides in section 1400 (c) that the definition of the term "State" shall include Puerto Rico. Therefore, all of these various provisions must be administered in Puerto Rico in accordance with the unemployment insurance law of Puerto Rico. But the fact is that Puerto Rico does not have an unemployment insurance law. Consequently there is no way in which the State law of Puerto Rico can be applied to Puerto Rico. Since the House version struck out the reference allowing Federal standards to be used in these various cases, there is no way that the Veterans' Administrator can pay the unemployment benefits in Puerto Rico except under Federal provisions to be prescribed by him.

It seems clear, therefore, that the only way in which the conference committee can avoid this absurdity—this discrimination—is to reinsert all the Senate provisions of the bill which provides that the Veterans' Administrator shall have the right to administer the bill on a uniform national basis.

EMPLOYMENT SERVICE PROVISIONS COMPLICATED

I should also like to point out that title IV, on page 63, of the bill relating to employment service for veterans, in the House bill is vastly inferior to and much more complicated than the provisions in the Senate bill. The provisions in the Senate bill were carefully worked out by the senior Senator from Missouri and myself with representatives of the American Legion who approved the Senate version. I still feel very strongly that the provisions in the Senate bill will promote the veterans' job opportunities better than the provisions that are found in the House bill.

The House bill in addition has attempted to include in section 607, on page 67, of the bill a completely unnecessary provision in no way related to the veterans' problem. Section 607 has absolutely no direct relationship to the bill but appears to have been inserted possibly in order to indicate that the Congress has already made a decision on the question of whether the entire employment service should remain a Federal service. As the Senate knows, Senator MURRAY and I have a bill pending, S. 1161, which provides for the continuation of the present Federal Employment Service on a Federal basis. This, to our way of thinking, is our only way to assure veterans and civilians alike the use of a truly national and efficient employment service in every part of our Nation. Section 607, inserted in the House, precluded full discussion of this problem by the Senate and I urge the Senate conferees to delete this provision which has absolutely no bearing on the pending bill.

EXORBITANT INTEREST RATE ON LOANS

Before concluding my remarks, I should like to point out one provision of the House bill relating to title III which

provides that interest up to 6 percent may be charged on loans made by the veteran for the purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business properties. In view of the present and prospective financial situation, I think that it would be exorbitant to charge the veteran as much as 6 percent interest on any such loan.

The Senate bill provided that any loan made by a veteran should not bear interest for the first year and that thereafter the interest rate should be 3 percent per year. The provision in the Senate bill seems to me fair and proper. I am inalterably opposed to the Federal Government permitting the veteran to be bled to death by charging him exorbitant rates of interest.

SUMMARY

I have tried to point out some of the most glaring and apparent discrimination and inequities in the bill as enacted by the House. Careful study by the Senate conferees will I believe convince them of the many injustices, restrictive qualifications and penalties which have been imposed on the veteran by the House bill. The bill in its present form is unworthy of approval of the Senate.

I have received hundreds of letters and telegrams from citizens of New York and from other States protesting against the House version of the bill. I hope that other Senators will join me in urging members of the conference committee to see to it that these unjust provisions are eliminated from the bill so that we may assure our fighting men throughout the world generous and fair protection when they return to civilian life. The harsh provisions included in the House bill are in direct contradiction to all the promises we have made to the men and women who are serving our country at this time. The unemployment compensation provision in the House bill is a snare and a delusion of our servicemen and women. In this present form the bill cannot be defended if we wish to claim that we want to protect our servicemen on a just and equitable basis.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, submitting, pursuant to law, a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 190 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under authority vested in the Attorney General together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

FREE POSTAGE FOR SOLDIERS, SAILORS, AND MARINES

A letter from the Postmaster General, relating to extension of the provision for free postage for soldiers, sailors, and marines beyond December 31, 1944, if there still exists a state of war; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

SETTLEMENT OF WAR VETERANS, WAR WORKERS, AND OTHERS ON THE CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the settlement of war veterans, war workers, and others on the Central Valley Project, for encouragement of the development of the project in family-size units, for cooperation by Federal, State, and private organizations to these ends, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

LIMITATIONS ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL, PRINTING AND BINDING, ETC., IN SEVERAL AGENCIES

A letter from the Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of letters addressed to the heads of the Office of Scientific Research and Development and the War Production Board which establish limitations on the amounts which may be expended for travel, printing and binding, and the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles from sums set apart in appropriations to these agencies for special projects (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Treasury (2), Navy (4), and Commerce (3); United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, National Housing Agency, Interstate Commerce Commission (2), and Federal Security Agency which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Yugoslav-American Central Council, of San Pedro, Calif., pledging support in the war effort and favoring official recognition of the National Anti-Fascist Liberation Council as the sole representative of democratic Yugoslavia and that the council be given essential assistance by use of the Lend-Lease Act; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution by the Council of the City of Minneapolis, Minn., requesting that Congress amend House bill 4576, relating to coal, and similar legislation, so as to protect the benefits of the river transportation of coal; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the eighth annual convention of the northern Washington district, International Woodworkers of America, at Seattle, Wash., favoring the extension and improvement of the Emergency Price Control Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the eighth annual convention of the northern Washington district, International Woodworkers of America, at Seattle, Wash., favoring the adoption of measures to establish a Nation-wide broadcast of congressional proceedings; to the Committee on Rules.

A resolution adopted by the eighth annual convention of the northern Washington dis-

trict, International Woodworkers of America, at Seattle, Wash., favoring the enactment of pending legislation to eliminate the poll tax in Federal elections; ordered to lie on the table.

Resolutions by the Central Labor Council of Kalispell and Laborers Local, No. 273, of Great Falls, both in the State of Montana, favoring the adoption of measures to establish a Nation-wide broadcast of congressional proceedings; to the Committee on Rules.

A resolution of the International Woodworkers of America (C. I. O.), of Deer Park, Wash., favoring the extension and improvement of the Emergency Price Control Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A resolution unanimously adopted by the Methodist Ministerial Association of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring the inclusion of milk in any program of school lunches; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Baltimore, Md., favoring repeal of the land-grant provisions of the act relating to transcontinental railroads; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—RESOLUTION OF MANITOWOC, WIS., CITY COUNCIL

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Manitowoc, Wis., on May 15, 1944, in relation to the St. Lawrence seaway project.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas hearings are to be conducted by the special St. Lawrence subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee May 15 or thereafter, for the purpose of hearing all matters pertinent to the development and completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and

Whereas this matter is now before Congress for their consideration and decision; and

Whereas this development will open up a new shipbuilding resource of great capacity in Manitowoc, which is in close proximity to raw material, and will make it possible to turn out large numbers of naval craft, merchant vessels, and auxiliaries of all types on the Great Lakes. Likewise, it will provide low-cost water transportation for the agricultural and industrial produce of the Middle West and thereby open new markets in Canada, Europe, and Latin America; and

Whereas we likewise deem this development to be of paramount importance and to the best interests of our Nation for defense and commerce: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the mayor and Common Council of the City of Manitowoc, That we go on record unqualifiedly in favor of this development, satisfied that it will result in great and lasting benefits to the Nation as a whole; be it further

Resolved, That we earnestly recommend that construction of this waterway be commenced as soon as labor and materials are available; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Hon. John H. Overton, chairman of Senate Finance Committee; Senator George D. Aiken; Senator Robert M. La Follette; Senator Alexander Wiley; Congressman La Vern Dilweg; and H. C. Brockel, secretary of Great Lakes Harbors Association.

Introduced May 15, 1944.

Adopted May 15, 1944.

EMIL BENISHEK.
OSCAR L. ANDERSON.
WILLIAM SCHROEDER.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED ON POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY AT BRISTOL, CONN.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD at this point a resolution which I have received from officers of the Polish-American Central Committee of Bristol, Conn., representing 14 Polish-American organizations of that town. The resolution was adopted at a Polish Constitution Day observance on May 7, and refers to the present plight of Poland. It urges an open declaration of war aims and a frank statement of policy by our Government clearly defining coordination of military and diplomatic strategy.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the passing years are bringing added significance to the observance of Polish Constitution Day on the 3d of each May, and, because of the war, this year's observance stresses more forcibly than ever before the pertinence of the one-hundred-and-fifty-three-year-old document, and particularly its preamble, which declares "the political existence, the external independence, and internal freedom" of a nation to be "dearer than life" itself; and

Whereas, upon its adoption, the Polish Constitution of 1791 was hailed by Edmund Burke to be the "noblest benefit received by any nation at any time," and, at the present time, it is regarded by Poles who have become American citizens and by Americans of Polish extraction to be a prized heritage which has inspired them to become better Americans; and

Whereas the observance of the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the Polish Constitution might well be dedicated to contemplation of the present plight of Poland, the first of the Allied nations to offer resistance to the Nazi hordes, and of her sister nations in captivity; and

Whereas such contemplation cannot ignore the fierce love of liberty and self-determination of the Poles which gained new strength and hope from the declarations contained in the Atlantic Charter; nor ignore the right of the Polish Government in exile, together with other governments-in-exile, to be apprehensive of their future boundaries in consequence of the failure of our Government to take steps to prevent the aggrandizement of one Allied nation at the expense of another: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the undersigned officers of 14 Polish-American organizations in Bristol, Conn., comprising about 2,000 members, urge open declaration of war aims and a frank statement of policy by our Government clearly defining coordination of military and diplomatic strategy to the end that the principles laid down by the Atlantic Charter shall not be violated and that our boys shall not have died in vain; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution as adopted at a Polish Constitution Day observance in Bristol, Conn., on this 7th day of May 1944, be addressed to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Secretary of State Cordell Hull, Senators Francis Maloney and John A. Danaher, Congressman-at-Large B. J. Monkiewicz, and Congressman William J. Miller.

THE POLISH-AMERICAN CENTRAL
COMMITTEE OF BRISTOL, CONN.,
ALEX. P. KRISCIENSKI,

President.

Mrs. JOHN J. KACZKA,

Vice President.

PETER LATALA,

Treasurer.

Mrs. W. BRZEZINSKI,

Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

H. R. 4710. A bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 900).

By Mr. BREWSTER, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 1934. A bill to provide for abandonment of the project authorized in the act of October 17, 1940, for a seaplane channel and basin in Boston Harbor, Mass.; without amendment (Rept. No. 901).

By Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1453. A bill for the relief of the City National Bank Building Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 902).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on May 19, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 771. An act to provide for payment of pensions and compensation to certain persons who are receiving retired pay; and

S. 1618. An act to amend the acts of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 866), May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347), June 15, 1938 (52 Stat. 699), and June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1205), which authorizes the appropriation of receipts from certain national forests for the purchase of lands within the boundaries of such forests, to provide that any such receipts not appropriated or appropriated but not expended or obligated shall be disposed of in the same manner as other national-forest receipts, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Vice Admiral Marc A. Mitscher, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 21st day of March 1944;

Rear Admiral John H. Hoover, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 1st day of January 1943;

Capt. Matthias B. Gardner, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 19th day of July 1943;

Capt. George T. Owen, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, Fleet Air Wing 15, and commanding officer, naval air station, Port Lyautey; and

Sundry citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 1942. A bill for the relief of Dr. E. S. Axtell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. 1943 (by request). A bill for the relief of the Trust Association of H. Kempner; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. WAGNER introduced Senate bill 1944, which was referred to the Committee on the Library, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 1945. A bill relating to the admission of attorneys at law to practice before departments and agencies of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], I ask consent to introduce a bill expanding the vocational training and retraining programs for occupational adjustment and readjustment of veterans returning from military service, and so forth.

I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor for consideration, and that a copy of it be referred to the special Senate Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning for study.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

By Mr. GEORGE (for himself, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. HILL, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. LA FOLLETTE):

S. 1946. A bill to provide vocational training and retraining programs for the occupational adjustment and readjustment of veterans returning from military service, workers demobilized from war production plants and for other youth and for adults, that individuals and the Nation may attain economic stability and security, and to further extend the program of vocational education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE:

S. 1947. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1948. A bill to provide for the settlement of war veterans, war workers, and others on the Central Valley project, for encouragement of the development of the project in family-size units, for cooperation by Federal, State, and private organizations to these ends, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

BOOKS FOR THE ADULT BLIND

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill to amend the act to provide books for the adult blind, and so forth. In this connection I request that a statement relating to the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1944) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide books for the adult blind" was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Library.

The statement presented by Mr. WAGNER is as follows:

STATEMENT REGARDING A BILL TO AMEND THE ACT TO PROVIDE BOOKS FOR THE ADULT BLIND TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE REPAIR AND MAINTENANCE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED TALKING-BOOK MACHINES AND FOR TALKING-BOOK RECORDS FOR BLINDED SERVICE PERSONNEL

In 1931 the Federal Government assumed responsibility for the library service for the blind. An appropriation is made annually to the Library of Congress to meet the cost of manufacturing books for the adult blind.

These books are placed in 27 regional distributing libraries, most of which are maintained by local funds. The distributing libraries meet the cost of circulation and the Federal Government meets the cost of the books. The cost of circulating books for the blind met by local libraries is about equal to the cost of the books provided by the Federal Government.

At present the annual appropriation for books for the adult blind is \$370,000. This is allotted as follows: \$100,000 for books in raised characters; \$250,000 for books on sound-reproduction records (talking books); and \$20,000 for the maintenance and replacement of the Government-owned reproducers for the sound-reproduction records for the blind (talking-book machines).

The 23,000 talking-book reproducers owned by the Federal Government were constructed on a W. P. A. project sponsored by the Library of Congress and managed by the American Foundation for the Blind. The cost of constructing these machines was slightly over \$1,000,000. These machines are lent to blind people who cannot afford to buy them. In addition to these, about 5,000 machines are owned by blind people. The present \$20,000 appropriation for the maintenance and replacement of the Government-owned reproducers takes care of the maintenance of less than half the machines needing repairs each year with nothing for replacements. The balance of the machines out of commission is being stored awaiting repairs. If 3,000 machines are allowed to go out of commission annually, it will not be long before most of the blind people will be deprived of the use of the talking-book libraries.

Instead of \$20,000, \$50,000 should be expended annually for the maintenance of talking-book machines; an additional \$50,000 should be spent for replacement of machines which are worn out: \$250,000 should be expended, as at present, for the production of talking-book records for the civilian blind; and at least \$50,000 should be spent for records of special interest to blinded servicemen.

The language of H. R. 4729 sponsored in the House by Mr. O'TOOLE would authorize the appropriation of a lump sum for talking-book records and for the maintenance and replacement of talking-book machines. This will give greater flexibility to the administration of the act so that the Library of Congress may decide each year what proportion of the appropriation should be spent on new records and what proportion on the maintenance and replacement of talking-book machines.

In brief, H. R. 4729 provides \$100,000 for Braille books, as at present and \$400,000 instead of the present \$270,000 for the maintenance and replacement of talking-book machines and for the manufacture of records for the war and civilian blind.

Fifty thousand dollars for replacements of worn-out machines will provide approximately 1,250 machines a year. It would be better if \$150,000 could be expended for this purpose because if we replace only 1,250 machines annually, some of the machines on hand will be 20 years old before we get around to replacing them. The Library of Congress, however, feels that \$50,000 worth of replacement machines is all that Congress would provide at present. As a matter of fact we would probably have difficulty obtaining materials with which to manufacture more than 1,250 machines a year until the war is over. After the war it will be necessary to ask for another amendment to this law providing an additional \$100,000 for replacements. In view of this fact no one can justly contend that the present bill is asking for more money than is needed.

This bill does not duplicate the bill authorizing the Veterans' Administration to provide guide dogs and mechanical and elec-

tronic equipment to blinded service personnel as the Veterans' Administration has no intention of setting up a special library service for blinded veterans. Representatives of that agency have already requested the Library of Congress to handle the library service for blinded ex-servicemen.

It should be pointed out that few persons losing their sight after reaching adult years ever learn to read Braille with any satisfaction. Therefore practically all the blinded veterans will be dependent upon the talking-book libraries for their reading matter. Fifty thousand dollars will provide these men with 20 or 25 titles a year of special interest to them. Of course, they will be interested also in the general talking-book reading matter provided the civilian blind.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4624) to consolidate and revise the laws relating to the Public Health Service, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself, Mr. AUSTIN, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLARK of Idaho, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NYE, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SCRUGHAM, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. THOMAS of Idaho, Mr. WHEELER, and Mr. WILSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WAGNER AT I AM AN AMERICAN DAY MEETING

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at I Am An American Day meeting, held at Central Park Mall, New York, on May 21, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE WAR IN REVIEW—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TRUMAN

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The War in Review," delivered by Senator Truman before the annual luncheon meeting of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, at the Hotel St. George, Brooklyn, N. Y., on May 22, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR BALDWIN OF CONNECTICUT BEFORE VERMONT REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION

[Mr. AUSTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the keynote speech delivered by Hon. Raymond E. Baldwin, Governor of Connecticut, before the Vermont Republican State convention, Montpelier, Vt., May 17, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

A PLATFORM FOR AMERICA—ADDRESS BY FORMER GOVERNOR LANDON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Platform for America," delivered by former Governor Landon, of Kansas, before the one hundred and forty-seventh Rotary International district conference luncheon, Chicago, Ill., May 16, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

T. V. A. ON THE JORDAN, ARTICLE BY HON. GEORGE W. NORRIS

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "T. V. A. on the Jordan," by Hon. George W. Norris, from the New Republic, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL REGULATION OF MEDICINE—REPORT OF AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

[Mr. OVERTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the conclusion of the American Bar Association committee report on certain provisions of the Wagner-Murray bill, S. 1161, relating to Federal regulation of medicine, which appears in the Appendix.]

IRRIGATION PROJECTS—EDITORIAL FROM KANSAS CITY STAR

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why Add Four Million Acres?" published in the Kansas City Star of May 14, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEND LEASE IN SOUTH AMERICA—ARTICLES FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two of a series of articles by Stanley Johnston, from the Chicago Tribune, relating to lend-lease in South America, which appears in the Appendix.]

MANPOWER—REPORT BY LAWRENCE A. APPEL

[Mr. MURDOCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a report by Lawrence A. Appley, Deputy Chairman and Executive Director of the War Manpower Commission, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH FOR MARCH 1944

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, on itemized statement of the number of Federal employees as of March 1944, as compared with February 1944, showing a net increase of 13,986, and also to include an accompanying statement.

There being no objection, the statement and itemization were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I wish to present a report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the month of March 1944.

The total number of paid employees for March 1944 is 3,286,015, including 288,563 civilian employees of the War Department stationed outside of the continental United States as of December 31, 1943. Complete figures are now available on these employees for the first time. Twenty-two thousand seven hundred and eighty-six of these employees are United States citizens; 37,576 are United States citizens by virtue of residence in Territories, and 228,201 are noncitizens.

There has been a net increase of 13,986 civil-service employees in the United States since the end of February and a total increase of 28,174 employees since January 1 when Federal civilian employment again started on an upward trend.

Thirty departments and agencies have increased the number of their employees by 20,170 during the month of March, while 31 departments and agencies have eliminated only 6,184 employees.

Substantial increases were made by the following: Navy Department, 8,216; Treasury Department, 3,096; War Department, 2,706; Office of Price Administration, 1,576; War Manpower Commission, 1,148; and Veterans' Administration, 851.

Greatest reductions were made by the following: Panama Canal, 1,119; Tennessee Valley Authority, 815; Department of Commerce, 580; National Housing Agency, 398; and the War Production Board, 346. The monthly fluctuation of the number of temporary substitute employees of the Post Office Department accounted for 1,859 of the total reductions.

Civilian employment of the executive branch of the Federal Government by department and agency for months of February and March 1944, showing increases and decreases in number of paid employees

Department or agency	March 1944	February 1944	Increase	Decrease
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT				
Bureau of the Budget	555	553	2	
DEPARTMENTS				
State Department	8,533	8,476	57	
Treasury Department	90,370	87,274	3,096	
War Department	1,214,655	1,211,949	2,706	
Justice Department	29,518	29,556		38
Post Office Department	349,237	351,096		1,859
Navy Department	735,977	727,761	8,216	
Interior Department	40,078	39,896	182	
Agriculture Department	80,015	80,226		211
Commerce Department	29,435	30,015		580
Labor Department	6,031	5,862	169	
NATIONAL WAR AGENCIES				
Committee on Fair Employment Practice	119	110	9	
Division of Central Administrative Services	4,111	4,208		97
Foreign Economic Administration	5,942	5,766	176	
National War Labor Board	3,972	3,423	549	
Office of Alien Property Custodian	924	981		57
Office of Civilian Defense	730	791		61
Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs	1,377	1,391		14
Office of Defense Transportation	5,083	4,994	89	
Office of Economic Stabilization	10	11		1
Office of Scientific Research and Development	1,214	1,203	11	
Office of War Information	6,533	6,229	304	
Office of War Mobilization	23	19	4	
Smaller War Plants Corporation	1,762	1,789		27
War Manpower Commission	25,846	24,698	1,148	
War Production Board	17,183	17,529		346
War Shipping Administration	4,973	4,872	101	
Office of Censorship	12,297	12,265	32	
Office of Price Administration	57,842	56,266	1,576	
Office of Strategic Services	1,793	1,843		50
Petroleum Administrator for War	1,334	1,390		56
Selective Service System	23,906	23,642	264	

Civilian employment of the executive branch of the Federal Government by department and agency for months of February and March 1944, showing increases and decreases in number of paid employees—Con.

Department or agency	March 1944	February 1944	Increase	Decrease
INDEPENDENT ESTABLISHMENTS				
American Battle Monuments Commission	1	1	0	0
Board of Investigation and Research—Transportation	51	64		13
Civil Aeronautics Board	333	336		3
Civil Service Commission	7,372	7,337	35	
Employees' Compensation Commission	513	514		1
Export-Import Bank of Washington	60	61		1
Federal Communications Commission	2,175	2,164	11	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,047	1,050		3
Federal Power Commission	664	667		3
Federal Security Agency	30,880	30,850	30	
Federal Trade Commission	458	459		1
Federal Works Agency	20,394	20,574		180
General Accounting Office	11,095	10,979	116	
Government Printing Office	7,529	7,683		154
Interstate Commerce Department	2,156	2,169		13
Maritime Commission	9,922	9,858	64	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	5,360	5,123	237	
National Archives	354	350	4	
National Capital Housing Authority	262	262		10
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	18	18	0	0
National Gallery of Art	264	261	3	
National Housing Agency	19,780	20,178		398
National Labor Relations Board	681	726		45
National Mediation Board	89	95		6
Panama Canal	30,305	31,424		1,119
Railroad Retirement Board	1,748	1,748	0	0
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	7,874	7,747	127	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,213	1,230		17
Smithsonian Institution	426	431		5
Tariff Commission	307	306	1	
Tax Court of the United States	123	123	0	0
Tennessee Valley Authority	22,261	23,076		815
Veterans' Administration	50,369	49,518	851	
Total	2,997,452	2,983,466	20,170	6,184
War Department civilian employees stationed outside of continental United States, as of Dec. 31, 1943	288,563	288,563		
Grand total	3,286,015	3,272,029		
Net increase			13,986	

¹ Does not include employees outside of the continental United States.

² Includes 10,324 employees of stations in the hands of the enemy.

³ Now includes War Relocation Authority.

⁴ Also includes Training Within Industry and the U. S. Employment Service.

⁵ Also includes National Railway Labor Panel and National Railroad Adjustment Board.

⁶ Reported quarterly only. Latest date for which these have been reported.

NOTE.—Employment figures now reported to the committee include dollar-per-annum employees and without-compensation employees of the consultant-expert type who are authorized to receive per diem in lieu of subsistence.

HISTORY OF PROHIBITION

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I rise to make brief reference today to a most

unusual and enlightening document which I have received from Mr. Edwin B. Wilson, editor of the Brooklyn Eagle, one of the great metropolitan daily newspapers in the famous borough of homes and churches, the Borough of Brooklyn, in my own State of New York.

This publication is entitled "History of Prohibition." The reasons which inspired its publication and a description of its contents are set forth in the foreword on page 1, as follows:

Recently there has been talk of restoring prohibition as a wartime measure. This effort the Brooklyn Eagle views with alarm, not because it is against abstinence as a personal privilege but because it fears that the return of prohibition will bring again an increase in crime and disrespect for law and a lowering of public morals.

Those who advocate the return of prohibition may have forgotten that earlier era unparalleled in our national history for organized crime and attendant evils. To remind them, and to refresh the memories of those who agree with the Eagle, this History of Prohibition is published. It is the essence of the editorial comment on "the great experiment" ended by repeal in 1933.

The Eagle was alive to the goings on during that period. Besides the current news it published no less than 607 editorial comments. From these, 200 have been culled and briefed. The bulk—183—tells the day-by-day story; 17 are selected because they express the Eagle's attitude then and now. The collection, we believe, furnishes the only comprehensive historical account on this subject and is invaluable to anyone concerned with aspects of this social problem.

I wish it were practicable to reprint this entire volume in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the people of every State of the Union might share in the benefits to be derived from recalling, with the Brooklyn Eagle, the events which led up to prohibition, the evils which were visited upon our people during that dark era, and finally, repeal.

I am sure that anyone who reads with care, and learns the lesson to be learned from this compilation, will firmly resolve that the same mistake must not be made again.

Freedom of the press is one of the great bulwarks of our democracy. In the exercise of that freedom, the newspapers of America, large and small, have made a mighty contribution to the general welfare of our Nation.

This History of Prohibition, compiled and published by the Brooklyn Eagle, is in keeping with the traditional policy of that newspaper which has faithfully served the citizens of Brooklyn for so many generations. Justifiable civic pride, fervent patriotism, fearless courage, intelligent leadership, wise planning, painstaking effort, and, finally, a deep sense of the responsibilities of citizenship, have been combined in this effort of the publisher to light the path of those who share in the shaping of our destinies, that they may lead our country away from the pitfalls which experience has taught are dangerous to our institutions. I wish to pay public tribute, by these brief remarks, to the men and women responsible for this document.

Since it is not practicable to reprint all the material, I commend especially for attention the legislative history of

the eighteenth amendment and its repeal, appearing on page 2, the editorials on pages 18 and 19, entitled "Today" and "And in 1919," respectively, and the very excellent summary of this subject contained in the editorial on page 20 under date of February 21, 1933, entitled "America Without Prohibition." I ask unanimous consent that these items to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD in that order at this point.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EIGHTEENTH AMENDMENT

The eighteenth amendment to the Constitution was submitted to the States by Congress December 18, 1917.

The first State, Mississippi, ratified it January 8, 1918.

The thirty-sixth State, Nebraska, ratified it January 16, 1919.

Whereupon, by proclamation of the Secretary of State January 29, 1919, it became effective 1 year from that date, January 16, 1920.

The legislatures of 45 States had ratified it by February 25, 1919.

The forty-sixth State, New Jersey, ratified it March 9, 1922.

It was not ratified by Connecticut and Rhode Island.

The Volstead (prohibition enforcement) Act was passed by Congress October 28, 1919, and went into effect January 17, 1920.

A bill passed by Congress amending the Volstead Prohibition Enforcement Act to legalize 3.2 percent beer and wine was signed by President F. D. Roosevelt March 22, 1933.

The act went into effect April 7, 1933.

The adoption of the twenty-first amendment (repealing the eighteenth amendment) by 37 States was proclaimed in force December 5, 1933.

TODAY, JANUARY 9, 1944, UNDERWORLD WOULD WELCOME THE RETURN OF PROHIBITION

It is hard to believe that there could be a serious demand for the return of prohibition from any responsible source, but it is here. Actually its advocates secured more than 100,000 signatures to petitions for immediate legislative action by Congress and a House judiciary subcommittee will begin public hearings this week on the subject.

How any one with a memory long enough to recall what happened under the first national prohibition law could support its revival, we fail to understand.

If the idea is to stop the drinking of alcoholic beverages, supporters of national prohibition may as well drop the plan now. One of the things proved during the period from 1919 to 1933 was that you cannot stop such drinking.

All that happened was that the business was driven underground. Smuggling and bootlegging became the order of the day. The character of the liquor deteriorated. Speakeasies were on every hand.

In the train of prohibition came a wave of crime, and particularly racketeering. Indeed, all our modern rackets—in business, in labor, and all the rest—trace back to that amazing era. The racketeers would not hesitate to murder in order to deliver the illicit liquor they handled.

Furthermore, a vein of corruption ran through official life, contaminating courts, legislative and law-enforcement bodies.

Naturally, this developed a complete contempt for the prohibition laws and out of that grew a general disrespect for all laws. The damage done by prohibition to the moral fiber of the American people is incalculable.

At the same time prohibition undid all the good that had been gradually accom-

plished by sane temperance campaigns through the years. Before 1919 we can understand how sincere temperance workers might have hoped for good results from this experiment noble in purpose. But we fail to see how such idealists can cherish a similar hope today when the record of 1919-33 is there for all to see.

It is our considered opinion that the chief beneficiary of prohibition would be the underworld. Undoubtedly the racketeers and gangsters and all the rest of the unsavory characters that amassed wealth under prohibition would welcome its return.

The self-respecting, law-abiding citizens of America should arouse themselves and demand that their Congressmen block this campaign for another prohibition era.

AND IN 1919, AUGUST 9, STILL TRYING TO FIGHT PROHIBITION

If the energy shown by opponents of prohibition since the constitutional amendment was adopted had been exercised when prohibition was still an open question the result might have been different. Men and organizations who slept placidly while the constitutional amendment was being fastened upon the country by a group of able and splendidly organized campaigners are now trying to find a way out after a solid wall has closed around them.

The counsel for the brewers and restaurant keepers of this State wants the next legislature to submit a referendum to the voters on the question of the sort of an enforcement law which shall be passed here; whether it shall banish all alcoholic beverages or shall permit the sale and use of wines and beer. There should have been a referendum on the question of the ratification of the constitutional amendment in this State. The legislature had no moral right, although abundant legal power, to act on that question without learning what the wish of the people of the State was. But a law passed now, saying that the Constitution of the United States should not be enforced here in the case of wines and beer would be merely a scrap of paper, if not, indeed, an act of nullification. Practically the enforcement laws of the States will make little difference. Congress has concurrent powers of enforcement and if its law prohibits the sale of drinks containing one-half of 1 percent of alcohol it will be enforced here, whatever this State may say.

The first remedy for the wets is to change the definition of "intoxicating" in the congressional enforcement law, provided that this Congress makes it too drastic, as is almost certain to be done. The next is to organize and carry through a Nation-wide campaign for the repeal of the eighteenth amendment. That last is well-nigh hopeless, but it ought not to be impossible in 1920 to elect a wet Congress, which in 1921 could amend the enforcement law to be passed this year. At least such an undertaking would be valid and would have a fighting chance. All other schemes to nullify constitutional prohibition are merely futile.

1933, FEBRUARY 21, AMERICA WITHOUT PROHIBITION

It is not easy to comprehend or contemplate what America will be like without national prohibition. So many factors have entered into the controversy over attempts to enforce an impractical law that many people have forgotten the real problems that existed before prohibition was adopted. Repeal of the eighteenth amendment and modification of the Volstead Act will revive those problems.

Prohibition failed for several reasons. It was regarded as an intrusion upon the per-

sonal rights of citizens and the rights of States. It failed to prevent drinking or to promote temperance. It led to widespread criminality and disrespect, not only for the prohibition law, but for all law. Finally, the feebleness of prohibition enforcement in the face of adverse public sentiment resulted in the creation of a gigantic liquor traffic that was absolutely without governmental control, and, while it enriched thousands, it brought no revenue to the Government.

Repeal of national prohibition will remove the complaint of interference by the Federal Government in the personal habits of citizens and in the rights of States to deal with their own problems. But repeal will not of itself remove the other serious conditions associated with the experiment in Federal prohibition. What has for so long been a national problem will soon be the problem of 48 States and tens of thousands of separate communities.

New laws will be needed. What is to take the place of national legislation will soon be occupying the attention of States. The problem is complex, but certain definite objectives should be kept in mind. First of all, the aim should be to get rid of the evils of prohibition itself. This will not be easy. There is grave danger that in a reaction against the eighteenth amendment we may be plunged into a period of extreme intemperance.

The greatest lesson of the prohibition experiment is that law, to be observed, must have the respect of citizens. New efforts to regulate the liquor traffic should be of the kind that will command such respect. We should make a supreme effort to curb the orgy of crime that has been associated with the era of bootlegging and racketeering. This means that the business of dispensing beverages must be made respectable and that there need be no excuse for evading the law.

In its later stages prohibition has become a matter of having Government reestablish some kind of control over the tremendous liquor traffic. Such control cannot be reestablished except by sensible laws, supported by local sentiment. But the weight of law must be brought to bear upon the dispensers of alcoholic beverages and not upon consumers. We need laws that those who buy drinks will have an interest in upholding.

Another important lesson going back to the old days is that most of the evils of the liquor traffic came from overstimulating the demand. Greed on the part of brewers and distillers, who stop at nothing to run up sales, caused the revolt against them. This should be guarded against by laws that will limit the profits to be made on the traffic. This, in turn, will keep the traffic within bounds.

Repeal, despite the vote in Congress, is still some time off. But it is not too early to prepare for the change that will again put upon the States full responsibility for regulating the liquor traffic. The main purpose of new liquor regulations should be to devise measures that will bring back respect for law and order and restore to the country a sense of security and decency.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4679, the Interior Department appropriation bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4679) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask unanimous consent that formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be considered for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona and the Senate are undoubtedly familiar with the discussion had here a few days ago of the necessity for emergency flood-control work made necessary by the recent floods throughout the Mississippi Valley, if the levees are to be repaired in time to protect the growing crops at the time of the ordinary June and July floods. This matter was taken up a few days ago and discussed for some time. It was necessarily supplanted by the agricultural appropriation bill.

The Army engineers advise me that if the work is to be done at all it must be started immediately or it will be completely without force and effect, and I wonder if the Senator from Arizona will be willing to lay aside temporarily the Interior Department appropriation bill for the purpose of considering the flood-control measure. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] offered an amendment to the bill a few days ago and discussed it at some length, and I do not think consideration of the matter at this time would take any considerable amount of time.

Mr. HAYDEN. So far as I am personally concerned, I think an arrangement of the kind suggested might be made. I understood that an address was to be delivered to the Senate, and several Senators desired to speak on general subjects, so perhaps we will have to have that part of the Senate's business disposed of.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, this is a matter in which the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is very much interested. The junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is thoroughly familiar with it, and I suppose is able to speak for both Ohio Senators.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is entirely agreeable to me, if it will not take too much time, to lay aside the Interior Department appropriation bill temporarily.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, my colleague the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is much interested in an amendment to the bill. He realized the bill might be brought up today, and he is anxious to have it acted upon promptly, so he authorized me to present the arguments for the amendment in his behalf; and if I can do that, I am in favor of proceeding to the immediate consideration of House bill 4793.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator from Missouri will ask that the Interior Department appropriation bill be temporarily laid aside, I shall not object.

EMERGENCY FLOOD-CONTROL WORK

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that House bill 4793 be now considered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4793) to provide for flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add, at the proper place in the bill, a new section, to read as follows:

SEC. —. The Chief of Engineers of the United States Army is hereby authorized to repair and reconstruct dikes and levees along the south shore of Lake Erie in the Reno-Howard farm area, Jerusalem Township, Lucas County, Ohio, damaged in the extraordinary floods of July and October 1943, and to dewater and decontaminize the area affected in such manner as to make the land again suitable for cultivation in the year 1944. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for such purpose the sum of \$265,000.

Nothing in this act shall impose upon the United States any obligation, moral or legal, to maintain the dikes and levees repaired and reconstructed in this area or in any other area unless provided for by general law. The work shall not be undertaken until there has been formed under the laws of Ohio a conservation district covering the area in question and competent under the laws of Ohio to maintain the dikes and levees so repaired and reconstructed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the pending bill is identical with a bill I reported some 10 days ago from the Committee on Commerce, and which has been on the calendar for some time. The bill which is now before the Senate is a House bill, identical with the Senate bill to which I refer. It is an authorization for an emergency appropriation of \$12,000,000 for the repair of levees which have been broken by the very extraordinary and untimely floods which have taken place in the United States this year. The floods which have broken the levees in the Mississippi Valley and inundated millions of acres of the most fertile land in the world are not the ordinary floods which come generally in June and July, and which are as certain to come this year as the sun is to rise tomorrow morning.

Unless the levees are repaired, these millions of acres of fertile land will be subject to being inundated again, with the certainty that crops vitally needed in the economy of the United States this year will be ruined. The engineers have advised me that the time for making the repairs is very short and unless the authorization is made and the money supplied immediately there will be no possibility of saving the situation, and saving the crops, when the regular June and July floods occur. I hope very much that the measure may be passed immediately.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Without objection, the amendment—

Mr. OVERTON. No, Mr. President; I should like to be heard on that amendment. Perhaps the Senator from Ohio would first like to explain the amendment.

Mr. BURTON. Yes, Mr. President. The senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] on May 17 explained the amendment. I shall be glad to explain it again briefly. It relates to a flood situation in the State of Ohio, on the shore of Lake Erie, comparable to the flood situations which arise on the rivers of the country and to the one which is now being sought to be relieved by the legislation being presented by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

It so happens that this flood in Ohio was a flood on the Great Lakes, when the Lakes were very high and at the same time there was a windstorm which drove the high waters over these lands, breaking down some local dikes which had been erected there some 45 years before, and inundated some 2,200 acres of land at that point. It so happened that this disaster occurred in 1943, shortly after the disaster in the West, and therefore the relief bill which relieved the flood situation in the West did not at all relieve the situation in the East on Lake Erie, and there was not an opportunity to obtain that relief at that time. The senior Senator from Ohio sought relief from the emergency fund of the President. Marvin Jones, the War Food Administrator, recognized the necessity of this land as a part of the food-production program, but we were not successful in obtaining the money from the emergency fund at that time. The reason, as then indicated, was that there had not been authority granted as yet by the Congress of the United States covering this sort of a flood on lakes, as contrasted with the flooding of rivers.

Mr. President, the amendment involves only \$265,000. It expressly states that it shall not be regarded as a precedent for similar cases, because it says:

Nothing in this act shall impose upon the United States any obligation, moral or legal, to maintain the dikes and levees repaired and reconstructed in this area or in any other area unless provided for by general law. The work shall not be undertaken until there has been formed under the laws of Ohio a conservation district covering the area in question and competent under the laws of Ohio to maintain the dikes and levees so repaired and reconstructed.

Mr. President, in order to meet the housing situation there is a need for the houses which have been inundated by this flood. There is a need for the food which can be produced on this area. Although the amount involved is small, it is the contention of both the senior Senator from Ohio and myself that certainly this is precisely the same type of a situation that is being met by the pending measure, which provides \$12,000,000 to cover the flood situation on the Missouri River. We ask that there be included in

the bill, as an amendment, the provision for \$265,000 to cover a like situation on Lake Erie.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment. A number of years ago there were two adventurous men, one by the name of Reno, the other by the name of Howard, who desired to improve themselves financially. They owned along the shores of Lake Erie a considerable area of marsh land, so they conceived the idea of building a private dike which would keep the waters of the lake from inundating this marsh land, together with a channel which would take care of the surplus water, and they then would be able to dispose of the land. So the levee, or the dike, was built, and they placed the land upon the market as a speculative venture, and they sold it. Like a good many private levees which are built, it was built very poorly. The project failed. When the winds and the storms came and the waves rolled against the dike it gradually crumbled until about 2 years ago it went under, and now the thought is that the Federal Government should come to the rescue of this privately organized venture.

The bill making such provision was originally introduced by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and referred to the Commerce Committee, and then referred to the War Department for report thereon. The Chief of Engineers reported against the bill. The pending amendment, as I understand it, is exactly what the original bill provided. Am I correct in that respect, I will ask the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I may say though, in reply to the question, that the report of the Army engineers, as I understand it, is based on the ground that the Congress has not as yet authorized such action on lakes as compared with rivers, and that is why we are offering the amendment at this time. It is not that the engineers do not recommend that this work be done as an engineering project. I might interject at this point that this reclamation project was begun 45 years ago, and if it was good enough to stand up for 45 years I do not think it can properly be designated as a poorly constructed project. The land involved is fine farming land and productive of much needed food. The men who reclaimed the land should not be blamed for what they did. The land was reclaimed much as land is being constantly reclaimed in the West. It was done at their own expense. The dikes stood up against ordinary rises of water and wind for 45 years, and then were overcome by high water combined with high winds. It seems to me that under those circumstances, if relief is justified on the rivers it is equally justified on the lakes.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, this is not a flood-control project, and the Army engineers have reported against it. They do not go into the merits of the proposition, because the law does not provide now for any flood-control project of this character on the Lakes or on the coastal areas in the United States.

It would require millions upon millions of dollars, indeed billions of dollars, to undertake to take care of similar projects along the coastal areas of the United States and also along the Great Lakes. The engineers reported against the proposal. Had they reported in favor of it, they certainly would have required what they always require, that is certain restrictions and limitations which would have made necessary a certain amount of local contribution, and there is none whatsoever provided in the amendment. They would probably have required that one-half of the cost be borne by local and private interests, as the Senator from Ohio knows is provided in the pending rivers and harbors bill which the committee is considering.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. On the point suggested by the Senator from Louisiana that there may not be a requirement of a local contribution specified in the engineers' report, I wish to point out that in the amendment presented by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] it is provided expressly that—

The work shall not be undertaken until there has been formed under the laws of Ohio a conservation district covering the area in question and competent under the laws of Ohio to maintain the dikes and levees so repaired and reconstructed.

That certainly is as strong a reservation and obligation upon the locality as I have ever seen in bills of this nature. It makes the project absolutely conditional upon the formation of a local conservancy district to maintain the dikes completely.

Mr. OVERTON. The amendment is the local contribution of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], but it is not the local contribution which has been recommended by the Chief of Army Engineers. The amendment provides:

Nothing in this act shall impose upon the United States any obligation, moral or legal, to maintain the dikes and levees repaired and reconstructed in this area or in any other area unless provided for by general law. The work shall not be undertaken until there has been formed under the laws of Ohio a conservation district covering the area in question.

But how much money are the local interests to contribute? Are they to hold the United States harmless against any claim for damages, a provision which applies to all flood-control projects? Are they to supply the right-of-way for the properties? None of those things have to do with the Army engineers, and no recommendation has been made by the Army engineers, because they wholly and utterly disapprove of the project.

Mr. President, if we adopt an amendment of this kind we enter the domain of "pork barrel" legislation, against which we legislated a number of years ago, when we provided that no project in reference to rivers and harbors, regardless of where situated, whether it be on a river or anywhere else, shall be considered by the Congress until there has been, first, an authorization for a preliminary sur-

vey and report—and none has been had in this case—and, second, until a report is made by the district engineer to the division engineer, then by the division engineer to the Board of Army Engineers for Rivers and Harbors; and then from that Board the matter must be referred to the Chief of Engineers, who passes on it, and thence to the Secretary of War.

We have guarded against "pork barrel" legislation and the injection into rivers and harbors bills and flood-control bills, or other bills, of legislation of this character, in order that we might conserve the interests of the Federal Government, and not have the funds of the Treasury expended merely on the presentation of some Senator who desires to have a project undertaken in his neighborhood or within the confines of his State.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. The Senator refers to his opposition to introducing items into flood-control and rivers and harbors bills. Let me ask if the pending bill, to which the amendment is offered, is a rivers and harbors bill or a flood-control bill.

Mr. OVERTON. It should be a rivers and harbors bill.

Mr. BURTON. I wish to point out to the Senator that the bill to which we have offered the amendment is itself a special bill for special relief in a special area, based on a disaster.

Mr. OVERTON. Oh, the Senator may call it that.

Mr. BURTON. That is precisely the situation here. This Ohio area was officially declared to be a disaster area, and the Red Cross provided relief there. I see no reason why we cannot provide relief in that distress area, just as relief is provided in a disaster area farther to the west, along the Missouri River.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, there can be no area in the United States which needs flood control which is not an actual or a prospective disaster area. But the Senator's argument simply eliminates the matter of advice to the United States Senate—in fact, in this case it simply brushes it aside—because the Army engineers have reported against the project.

The main bill we are considering, which was introduced by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], was submitted to the Corps of Army Engineers. They made a report upon it. That report was considered, and the bill was recommended for passage by the Senate Committee on Commerce. On the other hand, the amendment has been rejected by the Senate Committee on Commerce, and has been rejected by the Army engineers. It should be rejected by the Senate.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I wish to emphasize the fact that this matter was submitted to the Army engineers. The estimate of \$265,000, which is included here, is their estimate. The ground on which the

Army engineers declined to go ahead and recommend the project is that they are not authorized to construct these projects on lakes, as contrasted with rivers. That is why the amendment is offered—to show that when there is high water and high wind on a lake, the result is the same as when there is high water and high wind or windstorms along a river, which is precisely what was stated by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, that is one of the grounds of rejection. Having rejected it, the Army engineers did not go into the question of local contributions. They did not go into other phases of the matter into which they would have gone under normal circumstances. They did not investigate such matters, because they rejected the item.

One of the grounds of rejection was that the Congress has authorized them to make a survey of the lake-shore areas throughout the United States. They are making that survey and will submit it to the Congress. When that report is made, Congress will act upon it and will formulate some plan of relief for lake-shore areas and for Atlantic and Pacific coastal areas.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me again?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. The survey to which the Senator has referred is the beach erosion survey. If we wait for that, the war will be over, the need for additional food will have passed, and the people who live in this particular area will have had their land under water for 2 years or more.

This matter is not one which merely involves a slight rise in the water along the regular shore line. In this case the people were protected in the use of their land by a dike which had been erected for approximately 45 years. That dike finally was washed out by the high water and heavy winds. This matter involves not only erosion, but flood and storms.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the ground upon which the Senator from Ohio defends the amendment represents an argument which can be made in favor of every flood-control and river-and-harbor project in the United States.

I think I have submitted my views on the matter. I yield the floor.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I know nothing about the special merits of this particular proposal. I am not familiar with the names of the men who originally built the dike, and I am not familiar with the facts about it. But I very sincerely hope that the amendment will be rejected, because to adopt the amendment will mean killing the bill. The effect of adoption of this amendment would be precisely equivalent to laying the bill on the table or defeating it by an outright vote. We know in advance that the House of Representatives will not accept any such proposal as that now presented. The amendment relates to a subject which is entirely separate and distinct.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall yield in a moment.

The amendment is a complete innovation and would establish a principle of appropriation which has never heretofore been recognized or adopted in this country and is on an entirely different theory.

The bill itself is an emergency measure, necessary to repair damage recently done, in order to bring into production very rich agricultural land. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio has to do with an entirely different principle, namely, that of repairing damage done to an area over a year ago. As I have said, entirely irrespective of the merits of the matter, entirely irrespective of the question whether the United States should afford relief to areas along lakes where damage has been done, as well as to damaged areas along rivers, the amendment, if adopted, would be as certain to result in the defeat of the bill as would a motion, if made and agreed to, to lay it on the table.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President—

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, the Senator said he would yield to me.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to ask a question first, I simply wish to ask the Senator from Ohio or any other Senator what is the nature of the property which has been damaged by the breaking of the dikes, and who are the people who are concerned. Is the property industrial or agricultural?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know nothing whatever about it.

Mr. OVERTON. It is partly agricultural and partly a resort area; partly urban and partly a resort for people of affluent circumstances, residing in the city of Toledo, Ohio.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it owned by various persons?

Mr. OVERTON. Oh, yes; the land has been sold to various persons.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, this area of 2,200 or 2,300 acres is occupied by 1,200 persons. About 400 different families reside there. The land is primarily agricultural. There are a few places which are used for summer recreation homes by people who live in the city of Toledo, Ohio. None of those homes are elaborate.

In about half of that area in 1942 450 acres of corn were raised, with an average production of 96 bushels an acre, or a total of 43,200 bushels. One hundred and two acres of wheat have produced 42 bushels an acre; 103 acres of sugar beets have produced 20 tons an acre; 60 acres of oats have produced 73 bushels an acre; 60 acres of barley have produced 38 bushels an acre; 100 acres of soybeans have produced 32 bushels an acre; 80 acres of alfalfa have produced 4 tons an acre, including three crops of alfalfa in one year. Furthermore, the people residing in that area raised hogs and cattle and sold them in 1942.

The area is one which contributes precisely the commodities to which Marvin Jones referred when he wrote to the President and indicated that this is the kind of area he wishes to preserve

in these times, in order that the people residing there may produce food for themselves and also food for sale. The area is valuable for housing purposes and for food-raising purposes during the war.

I wish to point out to the Senator from Missouri that the amendment is precisely what he says his bill is. It is an emergency matter. There has been a disaster there. The floods occurred in July and October, and this is the first season after that.

The project is a comparatively small one. Therefore, it does not involve the number of dollars of appropriations which a larger item would involve. But the issue is the same.

Let me say furthermore that I do not know how the Senator from Missouri knows what the action of the House of Representatives will be on this bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, let me say that is because I have been notified by the Member of the House of Representatives who will be in charge of the bill that he will not receive or accept such an amendment.

Mr. BURTON. Does that Member of the House of Representatives completely control the House of Representatives?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. He very largely does in this matter.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. It is a fact, is it not, that this project has been peddled all around through the governmental agencies, and finally has wound up with the Corps of Army Engineers. An effort was made to induce the President to use his emergency fund for the purpose. That was rejected.

It is true there is a report from the War Food Administration that some good food will be produced; but I can show the Senator countless acres of land in Louisiana where wonderful food can be produced at much less cost than the cost at which food can be produced in this area.

Mr. BURTON. I do not believe it is fair to say that it has been peddled all around. This is an area which needs relief. The people in that area have tried to obtain relief where it has been proper to do so. They properly asked for relief from the emergency fund. They properly asked for relief from the Army engineers. The Army engineers reply that the Congress has not authorized relief on the lakes as it has on the rivers. That is why this amendment is presented at this time, because Congress is the only agency which can act in this matter.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may I ask the chairman of the committee or the Senator from Missouri a question? If the Army engineers had recommended this project, would the chairman of the committee or the Senator from Missouri have been inclined to consider it favorably?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I certainly would not be inclined to consider favorably such an amendment to the pending bill, because it is on an entirely extraneous subject.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the Senator be inclined to consider it favorably if it had been recommended by the Army engineers?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If it had been recommended by the Army engineers, I would give it the fullest consideration as a member of the Commerce Committee. I would not under any circumstances be willing to accept an amendment which I know would kill the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. How else could this project receive Federal help?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In the ordinary course of legislation. That is the only way in which anyone receives relief.

Mr. AIKEN. Do I correctly understand that the Red Cross considers this a disaster area, and has extended aid?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I had not heard of the matter until it was brought up in the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] nods his head.

Mr. BURTON. The county declared it to be a disaster area. The Red Cross rendered relief in that area, as it would in any other disaster area. There is no question about it being a disaster area.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. [Putting the question.]

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 4793) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 1887 is indefinitely postponed.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4679) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, before we take up the bill for amendment, perhaps I should make a brief statement with regard to what it contains.

The amount of the bill as it passed the House was \$87,652,580. The amount added by the Senate was \$35,976,765.36. The amount of the bill as reported to the Senate is \$123,629,345.36.

I wish to compare that total with the appropriations heretofore made for the Department of the Interior. For the fiscal year 1942 the appropriations for that Department were \$272,365,000. In 1943, realizing that war was coming on, and for that reason expenditures not essential to the war effort might be reduced, the amount appropriated was \$198,122,000. In that year, after we got into the war, and after the Budget esti-

mates were made up, the Secretary of the Interior asked that his budget be reduced by \$10,000,000. He showed a very excellent spirit in that respect.

The principal items of increase in the bill are in the Bureau of Mines and in the Reclamation Service—about \$15,000,000 in each. I shall give a detailed explanation of them. The remainder of the increases are principally the restoration of Budget estimates. The House committee made reductions in Budget estimates in approximately 220 instances. The Department requested restoration in about 180 instances. The committee felt, inasmuch as the appropriations in the bill had been materially reduced compared to similar bills for former years, that certain restorations could well be made.

RECREATIONAL FACILITIES FOR SERVICEMEN—STOP-OVER STATION AT LEXINGTON, KY.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, stop-over stations and stage-door canteens in America for the benefit of the men in our armed forces and those of our allies have contributed greatly to the happiness and pleasure of our soldiers.

My attention has been called to one such facility at Lexington, Ky., which has made an outstanding record. Mrs. Desha Breckinridge is chairman of the committee which sponsored this stop-over station. I have received a letter regarding this activity from a member of the veterans' organization at Lexington, a very good friend of mine, Mr. V. L. Slade. This is an outstanding achievement, and the people of Lexington, Ky., are to be particularly complimented on this fine service to the men in the armed forces. Those responsible for the station are entitled to citation by the service command for their zealous devotion to the public welfare.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Slade, telling of the activities of this station, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STOP-OVER STATIONS, INC.,
Lexington, Ky., May 19, 1944.

Hon. A. B. CHANDLER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HAPPY: Kindly refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix as of May 11, 1944 to the speech of the Honorable MARION T. BENNETT of the Sixth Missouri Congressional District, relative to War Dads canteen on page A2277.

We wonder if you have overlooked what is considered the best servicemen's canteen in the United States of America and all points West located here in your own back yard. I refer to the Stop-Over Stations in Lexington, Ky.

These stations were in full operation March 1, 1942, organized in November 1941 before Pearl Harbor. At that time there were only a few servicemen here in Lexington these being with the R. O. T. C. at the University of Kentucky. In other words we were serving the man in uniform before he became popular and a sure bet.

Our stations were organized by the veterans' groups, and started with the large size sum of \$85 in the treasury. Our purpose was to offer a friendly hand to the boys who were

passing through, hence the name Stop-Over Stations.

As our armed forces grew and thousands were stationed here in our community we naturally grew with them and extended our services. Since September 1942 we have had sleeping accommodations for 200 men, of course free. We also have a colored branch as shown on letterhead and feed and house them also free.

Just to give you an idea of the size of this project it costs us \$23,000 last year to operate and at least 50 percent of our food was donated by the people of this vicinity. This food donation amounted to at least an additional cost of \$500 if we bought it on the market each month. This would have been an additional cost of \$6,000. The local laundries each take a month apiece doing our laundry free. This is a saving of at least \$2,000 a year. All of this makes the cost of operation at least \$36,000 a year and that ain't hay. Our total cost of help ran only \$4,000 a year due to the fact that we have 300 senior hostesses and 400 junior hostesses as well as the groups listed above helping to do all the work. Ours is not a doughnut canteen. Full meals are served at all hours. Boys who wish to catch any bus or train are called at any time.

The Stop Over has never sent house to house solicitors for funds. Your wife and daughter attended our formal opening and we had the pleasure of a song from your daughter.

We wish that you would take time off to investigate the record of the Stop-Over Stations and if the Honorable Congressman from Missouri has news that can get into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and a citation from the service command, God knows that you have a chance to put Kentucky and the blue grass before the entire Nation as well as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

How's about it HAPPY?

Very truly yours,

V. L. SLADE,
(Squash).

SHIPMENT OF FARM MACHINERY TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES UNDER LEND-LEASE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a few days ago I brought to the attention of the Senate the matter of shipping farm machinery to foreign countries under lend-lease. I desire to read a brief article which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald, in the column entitled "Capitol Stuff," by John O'Donnell, dealing with the problem of farm machinery:

W. P. B. Chief Donald Nelson is personally investigating the farm-machinery situation, which some farm leaders believe has in it the elements of a first-rate scandal. Nelson's assistants in charge of contract allotments for this essential machinery are alleged to have favored the big manufacturers. These industrialists have fallen down on their quotas. The result threatens to upset the War Food Administration's 1944 food-production plans.

Lend-lease shipments of farm machinery are moving on schedule to Russia and Great Britain. The alleged stall on domestic manufacture is reported due to refusal of the Big Eight to increase subcontracts among little manufacturers, fearing loss of post-war control over production and distribution. Nelson is looking particularly into this phase of the matter.

There is now a savage behind-the-scenes melee going on between Judge Marvin Jones' Food Administration and the Farm Machinery Division of Nelson's W. P. B. But both sides are taking seriously F. D. R.'s famous edict, at the time of the HENRY WALLACE-Jesse Jones public brawl, to the effect that the next administration official who howls his woes to the Nation's press can send his resignation

to the White House along with it. On the spot at the moment are two W. P. B. chiefs in charge of farm-machinery production—Col. Charles Deere Wiman (grandson of John Deere, of the Deere farm-machinery industry) and William K. Frank, copper products magnate.

I may add, Mr. President, that this is at the very time when my mail is flooded with letters from North Dakota to the effect that the farmers there cannot obtain combines, binders, drills, corn planters, or any other kind of machinery, nor can they obtain repairs. I have a nephew who is farming in that area. In order to get a combine, he had to go all the way to Oklahoma to purchase it and he had to agree to harvest a certain amount of the crop on the way back, which meant that he had to leave his farm for a period of 6 weeks in order to get a combine from Oklahoma and take it to North Dakota so that he could harvest his crop.

At the very same time, as Mr. O'Donnell says, combines and binders are being sent to Russia, Great Britain, and other countries. As a matter of fact, we cannot even obtain parts to repair the machinery we now have.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BRIDGES obtained the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in order that I may submit an amendment to a bill and make a brief statement in connection therewith? The statement will occupy about 10 minutes.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not wish to yield for that purpose. I am sorry.

TERMINATION OF WAR CONTRACTS—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me for the consideration of several Senate resolutions?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 288, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 288), submitted by Mr. MURRAY on May 2, 1944, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 198, agreed to February 8, 1942, which authorized the War-Contracts Subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs to investigate war contracts, termination of war contracts, and related problems, is hereby increased by \$10,000.

INVESTIGATION OF THE USE OF PUBLIC LANDS—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 294, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 294) submitted by Mr. McCARRAN on May 17, 1944, which had been reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "increased by" to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$5,000", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 241, Seventy-sixth Congress, agreed to May 24, 1940, and Senate Resolution 147, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to September 8, 1941, and Senate Resolution 39, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to January 23, 1943 (relating to the investigation of the use of public lands), is hereby increased by \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION OF WILDLIFE RESOURCES

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 293, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 293) submitted by Mr. CLARK of Missouri on May 17, 1944, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority contained in Senate Resolution 246, agreed to April 17, 1930, authorizing a special committee to investigate the conservation of wild animal life, hereby is continued from February 1, 1944, to the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress; and the said committee hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate \$6,500 in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for such purpose.

POSTPONEMENT OF MOVING DAY FROM SLUM AREAS OF THE DISTRICT

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, from the Committee on the District of Columbia I report favorably, without amendment, Senate bill 1941, to amend the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, as amended, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. The bill would postpone the day of moving by occupants of slums of the District of Columbia. We are anxious that the bill be passed by the Senate so that it may be considered by the other House before July 1, because if the bill is not favorably acted upon by that time the dwellers affected by the bill will be forced to move.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1941) to amend the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 (b) of the act known as the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, be amended to read as follows:

"(b) On and after July 1, 1945, it shall be unlawful to use or occupy any alley building or structure as a dwelling in the District of Columbia."

SEC. 2. That section 6 of such act be amended by striking "1944" and inserting in lieu thereof "1945."

AMERICA'S WAR AIMS

TRANSFER OF NAVAL VESSELS TO ALLIED POWERS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, before commencing my prepared remarks I should like to speak briefly on a subject which I feel typifies the actions on the part of the administration and which is disturbing the minds of the American people.

Reports have reached me that one or more units of the American Navy have been transferred to Russia. I have heard of at least one particular cruiser—and attempts have been made to seek either a confirmation or a denial of this information which has been bandied about among many persons for the past few days.

I believe, Mr. President, that the American people and that the American Congress are entitled to know the truth. I think that this is an example of where frankness should be the keynote.

I have supported the entire war effort. I have supported lend-lease, both in its original passage, the renewal of the act, and the appropriations for it. A substantial part of lend-lease has gone to Russia. We have given them tanks, planes, guns, ammunition, food, machinery, and other vital materials. I am in favor of doing all this. The American people are in favor of it. But if we have transferred, or intend to transfer any units of our Navy to Russia, the story is a different one. This is particularly true when we are engaged in an all-out war with Japan which, by its nature, will be primarily a naval war.

Russia is at peace with Japan. Therefore, we, principally, must carry the entire load of our war with Japan with help from only some of our other allies.

In fact, Russia and Japan have a non-aggression pact which was signed on April 13, 1941, and which will not expire for 2 years, or until April 1946.

I cannot understand the purpose of the transfer of a vessel or vessels of our Navy unless it is a part of our patchwork policy of appeasing Russia. I think that the American Congress and the American people are entitled to a forthright statement clarifying the entire matter, and telling us whether we have transferred any units of the American Fleet, and the reasons for such transfer.

ISSUES INVOLVED IN AN ENDURING PEACE

Mr. President, the issues of the present mortal struggle, which has engulfed the whole world, are yielding to the irresistible and merciless might of the

United Nations. The long night of agonizing uncertainty is streaked with the first faint gleam of the dawn of victory. This is the day for which the suffering peoples of the earth have waited, toward which they have labored with unmeasured courage and determination. This is the day which promised liberation from the hand of tyranny, freedom from fear and freedom from want. This is the day that promised peace.

All of this was envisaged by President Roosevelt in his inspiring speech on the "four freedoms" of January 6, 1941, from which I quote:

In the future days, which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms. The first is freedom of speech. The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way. The third is freedom from want. The fourth is freedom from fear.

And he went on to say:

That is no vision of a distant millenium. It is a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our own time and generation. The world order which we seek is the co-operation of free countries, working together in a friendly and civilized society. This Nation has placed its destiny in the hands and hearts of its millions of free men and women; and its faith in freedom under the guidance of God. To that high concept there can be no end save victory.

But, Mr. President, there must be some mistake. Even in the earliest morning hours of this day, which promised peace, there are ominous clouds of suspicion, misunderstanding hatred, greed, and confusion scudding across the horizon. A military victory is assured. That issue is no longer in doubt, but even before the final victory of arms is won, it appears, Mr. President, that the prospects of an enduring peace are more uncertain than ever. If a military victory is to be the only issue settled by this terrible ordeal of fire and sword, then quite obviously this was not and is not our war. The American people have not entered the lists merely for the sake of tilting lances. Even now, we are not fighting merely for the sake of fighting. We are not involved in this terrible struggle merely for the sake of bringing our knowledge of modern warfare up to date. The American people entered this war under the leadership of President Roosevelt, not just to save our own skins, nor to pull a few chestnuts out of this world conflagration for a few favored friends. If, ultimately, these prove to be the only reasons why we have girded ourselves through the past few years for the showdown of strength which is so imminent, if these are the only reasons why we have sacrificed our fortunes and our youth, then we have been tragically advised or misled.

Mr. President, because the matter which I am presenting is so urgent, from this point on, I shall address myself directly to the President of the United States.

President Roosevelt, the American people are not going to be content with a military victory only. We, as a people, are utterly in sympathy with your own sentiments which you expressed in a

radio talk on May 27, 1941, wherein you said:

Today the whole world is divided between human slavery and human freedom—between pagan brutality and the Christian ideal. We choose human freedom—which is the Christian ideal.

We will accept only a world consecrated to freedom of speech and expression—freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—freedom from want—and freedom from terrorism.

This means that the American people are not going to rest content with any issue out of this present struggle which results merely in a reshuffled game of balance-of-power politics, either in Europe or in Asia. We are not going to welcome any new-fangled sort of imperialism and, well you know, the people, whose highest representative you are, will never acclaim any outcome of this present conflict which merely sows the seeds of another and more horribly devastating war in the predictable future.

These are the anxieties and concerns which weigh heavily upon us as the world awaits with bated breath, the opening of the costliest and bloodiest clash of flame, flesh, and steel ever visited upon mankind; for, if this struggle ends only in a military victory we shall have won nothing but an armed truce and we shall have proven recreant to our duty. Surely you, President Roosevelt, are fully aware that such will be our fate and such will be the fate of the distraught peoples of the earth, except the whole venture upon which we have launched becomes the instrument of a high and noble purpose.

The late Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Frank Knox, warned us of the folly of unprincipled policies in 1941 when he said in an Armistice Day address:

War breeds vengeance. Vengeance breeds hatred. Hatred breeds revenge. Revenge breeds war. The circle must be broken if peace is ever to come either to Europe or to any other part of the world. The whole weight of the United States must be thrown upon the side of making a peace, not of revenge, but of justice and righteousness.

The world has looked to you for reassurance and leadership. The faith of millions of your fellowmen has been grounded in the high ideals and the integrity of purpose which you have constantly woven into your dealings with other nations. There has been no lack of such noble purposes. The air has been filled with the majestic flight of ideals which have flown from your tongue and pen. But now, for some mysterious reason, that flight is lost to view. President Roosevelt, the truth of the matter is that for the first time in American history millions of American boys, girls, men, and women are being called upon to make the supreme sacrifice for the sake of an ideal which has lost its shape, its sound, and its content. In olden days, men went into conflict with a battle cry ringing in their hearts and on their lips—a battle cry fashioned for them by those into whose hands they had entrusted everything worth living, fighting, and dying for. Wrought into those battle cries were the honor and integrity of that state or

nation which warriors of every age have so gallantly served.

President Roosevelt, it is not right that a free people, the freest people on earth, should be called upon to sacrifice their all while neither they themselves nor their loved ones on the battlefield nor even their highest legislative representatives know what the sacrifice is for. As of today, all of your former ideals and principles have taken cover beneath the empty slogans of "defeat Hitler," "destroy fascism." But surely you, our President, would not have us believe that these are adequate ideals or aims. With these phrases too much popular thinking has been content to stop, when actually, it is at this point where every high and noble purpose should begin. We have not gone to war merely to defeat Hitler, nor to win a test of strength by force of arms. Surely there must be something above and beyond all this for which and toward which we are striving. President Roosevelt, the whole world is breathlessly waiting on your every word for a renewal of the promises, the ideals, and the purposes which your spirit has so often envisaged and expressed. But there must be some mistake for the world waits in vain.

In this realm, your fellow men have a right to expect such a great hope from you, for your ideals and principles and purposes have long since been written into a record for all the world to read. For instance, on December 29, 1940, just a little more than 3 years ago, you interpreted the sentiments of the American people concerning tyranny and dictatorship, whether of the right or of the left, when you said:

No man can tame a tiger into a kitten by stroking it. There can be no appeasement with ruthlessness. There can be no reasoning with an incendiary bomb. The history of recent years proves that shootings and chains and concentration camps are not the transient tools but the very altars of modern dictatorships. They may talk of a new order in the world, but what they have in mind is but a revival of the oldest and the worst tyranny. In that there is no liberty, no religion, and no hope.

At that time you made no distinction between dictatorships in your utter condemnation of them. You, yourself, have declared a Communist dictatorship to be the epitome of ruthlessness by which to judge the Nazi regime, when on May 27, 1941, you said in a radio address:

The Nazi world does not recognize any god except Hitler; for the Nazis are as ruthless as the Communists in the denial of God. What place has religion which preaches the dignity of the human being, of the majesty of the human soul, in a world where moral standards are measured by treachery and bribery and fifth columnists.

You were speaking as a champion of the inalienable rights of your fellow men when you uttered these words. Yet since Teheran all these things have changed, President Roosevelt, the American people have a great admiration for any people who resist any and every aggressor, and our great and powerful ally, Russia, has superbly defended her soil and her very life. But again let me remind you that the American people have not

changed their minds concerning dictatorships. Great as is their admiration for the military prowess and stoical determination of the Russian people, they still prefer, above all else, the American way of life, and they openly disavow communism or a Communist nationalism. They are justly apprehensive of the policies and practices which such a way of life provides for securing a just and peaceful settlement of international problems and disputes.

Certainly the American people have not gone into this struggle for the purpose of turning over Europe to the control of any nation or group of nations, much less to substitute the terrors of one dictatorship for another. It is not and it has not been our intention to divide, actually or in effect, the war-torn European nations into special spheres of influence or to reduce this or that section of Europe under the control of any nation no matter how benevolently inclined such a nation might profess to be. In your silence on the prospects of establishing peaceful relations among free nations in Europe, let me remind you that only through a genuinely international organization which is all inclusive, wherein "all nations, great or small, victor or vanquished," may have equal opportunity to collaborate, can the highest purposes of the American people be realized. We have no desire to be a party to the establishing of any post-war organization which is to be dominated by one, two, three, or four nations.

Much less have we entered into our present military alliances in order that our own American ideals and principles shall be conditioned, if not altogether dictated, by either a prime minister or a dictator, or both. With great dismay we have observed the unilateral attacks upon the Atlantic Charter, the bold denials of this and that principle, the reservations and exceptions heaped one on the other.

Mr. Stalin, immediately following the Moscow Conference, launched upon a series of independent acts, every one of which was a violation of the principle of collaboration upon which we had agreed. First came the mutual assistance pact with the Czechoslovak Government-in-exile, then the Kharkov trials, then, in rapid succession, the entry of Russian troops into Poland without any statement that they came as liberators and not as conquerors; Pravda's rebuff of Mr. Willkie; the rejection of our good offices in settling the Polish dispute; the Pravda report of a separate peace negotiation between Britain and Germany; the unprovoked attack on the Vatican; the change in the Russian Constitution which established 16 constituent republics including the Baltic States; the recognition of Badoglio; and the demand for units of the Italian Fleet; with every act straining the relations between the Big Four.

Then, on February 22, Mr. Churchill announced complete accord with Mr. Stalin's views on Poland when he said:

I cannot feel that Russia's demand for reassurances about her western frontiers goes beyond the limit of what is reasonable and just. Marshal Stalin and I also spoke and

agreed upon the need for Poland to obtain compensation at the expense of Germany both in the north and in the west. Here may I point out that the term "unconditional surrender" does not mean that the German people will be enslaved or destroyed. It means, however, that the Allies will not be bound to them at the moment of surrender by any pact or obligation. There will be no question, for instance, of the Atlantic Charter applying to Germany as a matter of right and barring territorial transferences or adjustments in enemy countries.

On April 9 Mr. Hull announced to the world that—

There has been discussion recently of the Atlantic Charter and its application to various situations. It points the direction in which solutions are to be sought; it does not give solutions. It charts the course upon which we are embarked and shall continue. That course includes the prevention of aggression and the establishment of world security. The charter certainly does not prevent any steps including those relating to enemy states, necessary to achieve these objectives.

Does this mean, President Roosevelt, that you have lost the initiative in Europe? Is this why you have permitted these attacks upon the very document which you helped to create to go unchallenged? Is this why you no longer talk about a peace which shall endure? Is this why the New York Times and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of December 18, 1943, both quoted you as saying in your press conference—

The Allied conferees were motivated by the general thought that they did not want another war in the lifetime of the present generation.

I quote from the Christian Century of January 5 to remind you of the reaction of the American people to such a compromise, if compromise it was:

There was a time when the President talked of a lasting peace, a peace which would mean that never again would the sacrifices of war be required. Now, if this report is correct, in the informal intimacy of his press conference he says that what he and Stalin hope for is a peace that will last a generation. We do not believe that such a peace will satisfy the men who are doing the fighting or those at home who pray for them day and night. Peace for a generation is just another long armistice. Mankind demands something better than that.

Does this mean that already, at this stage of the struggle, you, the President of the mightiest and most glorious nation ever to grace the earth, have been compelled to compromise the ideal of an enduring peace? There must be some mistake. Surely you have not surrendered your hope that we shall be able to bring peace, a just and enduring peace, to this stricken family of nations. This is the ultimate problem we confront, and we respectfully urge you to reassure a waiting world. Let us hear you proclaim again that our highest motives, our noblest designs, are all for a peaceful world, where the "four freedoms" shall be secured to each and every nation. These are our peace aims; are they not? There is nothing to be ashamed of in them. We have no ulterior motives, no specially favored friends among the suffering peoples of the earth. We urge you to proclaim to them that all our resources, our

good will, and our concern are directed toward the establishment of a society of nations wherein law and order, mutual helpfulness and understanding, shall prevail, and that we are opposed to every form of dictatorship now as before.

President Roosevelt, your continuing silence will give substance to our deepening fears that you have already surrendered our right to speak for ourselves, that you are no longer free to herald our ideals, our own American ideals and purposes, to our fellow men. Has it happened that because we are now bound together through an Allied military command we are no longer free even to reassure ourselves of the high resolves that move us? Must we, as a free people, as a sovereign nation, wait upon the rulers of empires and totalitarian states for the opportunity and the occasion to reiterate our own ideals? Are we no longer free to speak for ourselves in moral matters?

I assure you that we entered this war as a free people, and we shall emerge a free people. But in order that this may be accomplished we must continue to conduct our relations among ourselves and between our Nation and other nations in a manner worthy of a free people. To this end the American people are determined we shall not be a party to blind and brute forces of destruction, nor to the creation of means for the settlement of international disputes which, by their very nature, partake of the forces we despise. We are not free to act without restraint, in defiance of the moral precepts of decency and justice. We are not free to become accomplices of tyranny and oppression, unrestrained by a noble purpose. The whole wide world is waiting for assurance that we have not deserted membership in the moral universe.

President Roosevelt, your silence in our behalf is precipitating greater and greater uneasiness and misgiving. Your silence has become embarrassing and humiliating. Mr. Stalin speaks and you are silent. Mr. Churchill speaks and you are silent. General Smuts speaks and you are silent. Mr. Fraser and Mr. Curtin speak and you are silent.

These men are speaking in such a manner that with every passing day the prospects of an enduring peace become more and more remote. Are you acquiescing in these rampaging demands, which will surely scuttle any peace if left unchallenged?

You can well understand that only the sincerest concern prompts these questions which are thronging our minds, and you must be aware that we cannot help but discover more and more ground for our fears as each day brings to light more of your policies in the fruit they bear.

For instance, we know that Mr. Hull's announcement of American foreign policy will never secure the kind of peace we seek if it rests upon unity at any price with any nation, or clique of nations.

We know that your risking our whole future and the future of the post-war world on the good will of Mr. Stalin, as Forrest Davis tells us you have done, in his two articles in the Saturday Evening

Post for May 13 and 20, will never be accepted by the American people as their only safeguard against war and the threat of war.

Our misgivings increase not a little when we are further told by Mr. Davis that "Stripped to the bare essentials we fought in 1917 and we are fighting now, to prevent the mastery of Europe by one aggressive power. Should Russia, as the sole European power, display tendencies toward world conquest, our vital interests would again be called into account."

What does this mean? Does it not mean that World War No. 3 hangs on the slender thread of Mr. Stalin's future disposition and good will?

We are amazed to read in the same article that you, our President, have learned thus far in this war:

That hereafter only countries with an abundance of manpower and resources plus huge industrial plants can engage in the business of war.

Do you wonder that the American people are uneasy over the prospects of peace in the future? If such a lesson is put into practice or such policies are continued much longer, with agitation for securing American bases all over the world, with a demand to make the Pacific an American lake, it is little wonder that increasingly shall we feel ourselves being drawn into a post-war world where no man or nation will be safe unless guns are carried on the hip.

The Washington Post of May 10 also carried a story of the three peacetime plans which the Navy has formulated in anticipation of almost any kind of situation to emerge from this war. As our President, which of these plans do you contemplate will most nearly suit our needs in the months and years to come?

In all this welter of uncertainty the people of these United States are convinced that any attempt to corner control of the international organization, about which we have heard so much talk, is doomed to failure at the outset if appeasement of a totalitarian state is made the cornerstone of such a policy.

President Roosevelt, we cannot see what kind of a peace you are planning after the military victory is won. On what basis will an organization for peace rest—on good will and understanding, or on a continuance of armed might and the balance of power?

Every indication is that in order to maintain any semblance of peace in the post-war world we must become a military people, with a military economy, ready to strike at any moment, armed to the teeth, suspicious, arrogant, coercing where we cannot win, condescending where we cannot dare to be magnanimous.

And, Mr. President, what are you going to do about all the promises that have been made as to how we shall feed and reconstruct and rehabilitate the world when the fighting stops? If we are going to be compelled to continue to put our resources into armies and navies, our manpower under conscription, our industry under the strain of producing armaments, we shall never be able to fulfill even a small part of our promises, and

the "four freedoms" about which we have talked so much will become sheer fantasies.

Again, may I quote from the wisdom of the late able Secretary of the Navy, Frank Knox:

There comes a time in the life of every man and every nation when principles cannot be sacrificed and when vital and essential rights can no longer be ignored, a time when to go further would mean that our own liberality and forbearance would be misunderstood.

What are our peace aims, Mr. President, and do they bode good or ill? Do they promise hope to a suffering and grief-stricken world? Do they seek to inspire confidence in the future? Are they universal in application, binding upon us all, permitting of no exceptions or reservations, tainted with no selfish or ulterior motives? Or, are they a patchwork of unprecedented and unpredicted necessities which will merely postpone the final issue of war itself to the not too far distant future? Why do you not take us, your own people, into your confidence, Mr. President? Is it because you wish to overwhelm us with joy when you suddenly pull a patchwork peace settlement out of your hat, or is it because the monster which you have helped to breed has broken its leash and is now at large?

There is no need for me to remind you that the questions I am raising are born of a deep devotion to our great America. From the first days when I saw the dark clouds of war gathering over our heads I warned our people of the danger that threatened and I have sought to do everything in my power to support and hasten preparations for our own adequate defense. From that day in March 1937 when I, together with five of my colleagues, voted against the enactment of the Neutrality Act, down through to the present hour I have vigorously supported every measure which would guarantee the safety of American ideals and the American way of life.

President Roosevelt, it is on this record that I stand when I now respectfully urge you to proclaim to the world the ideals for which you have thus far labored. Now is the time to reach an effective understanding with our allies concerning the ultimate peace aims which guide our common efforts toward the winning of this war. Now is the time to reach such a common goal. When the last blistering bomb has burst, there is little hope that what we could not attain and effect under the strain and incentive of a common fellowship in a common cause, could ever be realized through the cold and calculating concern of nations turned in upon themselves, brooding while they lick their wounds.

I urge you to proclaim to the world a statement of peace aims which are in keeping with the universal principles of the Atlantic Charter, and expressed in its plain and unmistakable language.

On a hundred battle fronts our young men and young women, the flower of our manhood and womanhood, are joined in battle with the foe. Surely no nation ever has had more cause than ours to be proud of the splendid record of heroic achievement or of the untiring and self-

less sacrifice of its people. Stretched over the face of the earth the mighty arm of our joint military command has wrought valiantly. From the fox holes of the New Guinea jungles, through the desert African wastes, on to the jagged mountains of Italy, strong hearts and hands have borne our Stars and Stripes on to victory.

Now, while millions of our own men and women crouch in tense anticipation of the word which will plunge the human race into the most titanic and brutal battle of all time; now, when every nerve is strained to catch the first syllable of what will be for many of our men the last command they shall ever obey; now, President Roosevelt, while the American people, whose servant and leader you profess to be, are gathering themselves against the mighty shock of such a battle—lift up your voice in a clarion call proclaiming to the world that America has taken the moral leadership of humanity into its heart and hands.

Now is the time. This is the hour. Tomorrow may be too late. Let our fighting men the world around find new meaning in their sacrifice and a deeper inspiration in their striving. Lift them up above the filth and grime of empty hopes and dreams and spur them on to victory. President Roosevelt, give the word, and these men and women will give their lives to make your highest dreams come true.

Let America speak. You are our leader, President Roosevelt; speak the word which will set American ideals burning in every heart, lift up our beacon of liberty before the weary eyes of men. Proclaim to the ends of the earth that we seek to preserve American ideals and the American way of life, that we seek to restore the birthright of every human being as a creature of God, that we seek a reconstituted Europe which is free from terrorism, want, and despotism, that all peoples, so far as lies within our power, shall have an equal opportunity to enjoy the blessings and riches of this life secure from the designing greed of any and every nation. Surely President Roosevelt, we have no other peace aims and we shall never be a party to the attainment of any others. Again I respectfully urge you to speak in the name of the American people the hopes and dreams which have so richly blessed this land we love.

THE GOVERNMENT OF LIBERATION IN YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. WALLGREN. Mr. President, a few days ago our South American ally and United Nations' partner in the war against the Axis, the great nation of Brazil, officially froze the funds held in that country in the name of the Royal Yugoslav Government in exile. For some time now evidence has been mounting to show that the royal government in exile is not an active ally in our war against fascism.

In my own State of Washington in an action, perhaps the first on the North American continent, certainly the first in these United States, the State senate unanimously passed a resolution calling upon the State Department not only to

freeze the funds held in this country by the royal government in exile, but to extend de facto recognition to the government of liberation in Yugoslavia, whose provisional president is a distinguished Yugoslav jurist, Dr. Ivan Ribar, and whose marshal of its Partisan armies is Josip Broz, popularly called Tito.

To make the action of our State senate the more impressive, let me remind you, Mr. President, that the State legislature was then in extraordinary session to consider only the question of legislation to facilitate soldier voting. In fact, the Governor of the State has specifically requested that only that question be discussed. Nevertheless, so strong was popular demand and so urgent the need that the senate, both parties of that body consenting, suspended the rules in order to pass the resolution directed toward the State Department and to the Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations Committees of Congress, urging Federal action to freeze the funds held in the name of the Royal Yugoslav Government, and recognition, de facto or de jure, of the people's government of Yugoslavia, officially known as the government of liberation.

Why there should be any hesitancy on the part of the State Department to extend recognition appears, to say the least, puzzling to me, in the light of recently disclosed facts. For example, on the anniversary of the birthday of America's great citizen soldier and liberator, Gen. George Washington, Prime Minister Churchill, in addressing the House of Commons in London, revealed that Marshal Tito and the Partisan forces have been our allies in Yugoslavia, while at least detachments and commanders under General Mihailovic have been aiding the Nazi enemy. The Prime Minister of Great Britain quite obviously should be in possession of the facts. His son, Capt. Randolph Churchill, at last report, was on duty with the Partisan armies in Yugoslavia. In that same speech, Prime Minister Churchill stated that more than 250,000 soldiers, men and women, were fighting in the ranks of the Partisan Army against the Nazis. He revealed that the Partisan forces, including the guerrilla arm of the army of liberation, had been engaging 14 of an estimated 20 Nazi divisions in the Balkans.

From the Prime Minister's own words we can therefore estimate what a debt we owe to these Yugoslav patriots who, after their official government had fled the on-rushing Nazi panzers, started from scratch to form a people's army and, through it, to establish the first second front in Europe. Bereft of arms and robbed of a questionable leadership by retirement from the scene of action of King Peter and his courtiers, the people of Yugoslavia—Croats, Slovenes, Serbians, Montenegrins, those on the Dalmatian coast and from the isles of the sea—united to wrest from the enemy the arms by which they fought the enemy himself.

Like our Continental Army of the Revolution, fighting for similar aims, they have been through a long Valley Forge,

and are now increasing both their numbers and their unity in the war of liberation. It has been their glorious fight which has deprived Hitler of divisions in Italy which might have added to the difficulties of our own advance up the Italian boot. If adequate military and medical supplies and more food were available to the Yugoslav army of liberation, Marshal Tito now estimates that, instead of merely 300,000, a million men and women could be aiding us in the battle of southern Europe which is aimed at the inner fortress of the crumbling Reich. Marshal Tito himself, in asking for additional aid, has prophesied that with it the fighting armies of liberation of Yugoslavia could cross over into northern Italy and eventually join us at the Po in a mopping up of the Nazi divisions now operating in Italy.

If there were any doubt left in our minds about the relative roles played in this war on Yugoslav soil by Marshal Tito and the Partisan forces, as against Mihailovic, war minister of the government in exile, and his so-called Chetniks, that matter should have been cleared up in an article by A. C. Cummings, cabled from London by the great Southam Press to Canada on May 5. As reported in the Vancouver Province, of British Columbia, Cummings wrote, in part:

The Yugoslav military mission now in London has left little doubt that General Mihailovic, leader of one group of Serb insurgents, and war minister in the exiled Yugoslav government, has been actively pro-German and has assisted the enemies of Yugoslavia in many ways.

Apparently the royal exiled government in London finally has repudiated Mihailovic for his aid to the enemies of the Yugoslav people and the United Nations. Until recently there was an effort on foot to rehabilitate the debunked Mihailovic myth.

It may not be long until, not a few, but many in the American and British Armies will know the truth about Yugoslavia. It is no secret that on D Day, or soon after, we may find our armies of invasion on Yugoslav soil, fighting to reach the southern bastion of Hitler's shrinking fortress in Austria. When that day comes, unless Mihailovic can be rehabilitated diplomatically, it will be impossible for the Government in exile to maintain control over the more than \$90,000,000 to which they now have title, because they are the recognized Government of Yugoslavia. It is tragic irony that the money now being spent in propaganda in the United States—the money which in addition is being squandered in exaggerated salaries for the king and his courtiers—is money which the people of Yugoslavia badly need to aid us in defeating our common enemy, Hitler's Reich.

Tito and the Partisan armies need military and medical supplies now. Their struggles for us on the field of battle, their sacrifice of life's blood, have earned for them the right to be treated as equals among the United Nations. Today, instead of occasional aid in the form of international charity distributed

to Partisan convalescent camps near Cairo and on the Island of Sardinia, full lend-lease assistance should be accorded this fighting vanguard of a democratic Europe. With this, they can save hundreds of thousands of lives of our boys during the impending battles. With it, they can strengthen the will to resist among the peoples held in Nazi thralldom beyond the frontiers of Yugoslavia, in Bulgaria, in Greece, even in Rumania, Hungary, and in Italy. The short and easy step to strengthening one of our greatest fighting allies in this war is through recognition of the Government of liberation of Yugoslavia as the sole agency on the soil of that country which is allied to us in our common battle against fascism.

A preliminary step of considerable importance can be taken now through freezing the funds held in the United States in the name of the royal government in exile, but which rightfully belong to the people who fight for Yugoslavia on Yugoslav soil. Brazil has led the way, but it is for us to complete the task, for America bears an extremely heavy responsibility toward the people of Yugoslavia. The funds which supply the defamers of the government of liberation and support the general who has given aid to the enemy, are funds held in American banks. It is a fact that while funds are also held in Britain in the name of the royal government in exile, it is the funds from America that pay the salaries of King Peter and the maintenance of his queen, the exiled Princess of Greece. A sum, which is estimated at approximately \$500,000 a year, including maintenance, gives Peter the dubious honor of being the second highest paid ruler in the world, and one who apparently dares not return to his native soil. So apparently callous is the Royal Yugoslav squanderbund in London, that when funds were being raised to give small aid through war chest drives to the fighting forces of the Partisan army, King Peter contributed not a dime in behalf of the suffering democratic peoples of his own homeland.

Recently Marshal Tito requested the immediate freezing of the funds of Yugoslavia now held by the Royal Yugoslav Government in exile. So far, only Brazil has answered that request with action. In the light of the facts, can we do less than the people of Brazil have done? Certainly Marshal Tito, who is called the George Washington of Yugoslavia, and is considered one of the great generals of this war, deserves at least the negative aid in his battle for us which freezing of the funds held in America in the name of the Royal Yugoslav Government could now give.

Personally, like my own friends in the Washington State Legislature, and the thousands more in all walks of life in my State, who are members of the American Committee for Free Yugoslavia, I hope the United States will do much more officially. I will not be satisfied, and I am sure that any who will investigate the truth about Yugoslavia will not be content, until de facto recognition is extended to the government of libera-

tion which fights with unparalleled bravery and against great odds with us against Hitler, and which fights for a post-war democracy throughout the Balkans, which, while recognizing the right of private property, will end the threat of imperialism and of new wars sweeping from a Balkan tinderbox throughout the world. With the fighting Partisan armies we can best say, "Death to Fascism! Liberty to the people!" and mean it by officially freezing the funds held in America in the name of the Royal Yugoslav Government in exile, and by speeding the de facto recognition of the government of liberation.

REEDUCATION OF THE GERMAN PEOPLE THROUGH GERMAN PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on one occasion Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes said something to this effect: "The thinker of today controls the future." The great football coach, Knute Rockne of Notre Dame, said something similar when he said "The idea is the thing." You and I, Mr. President, have seen the awful power of ideas—wrong and right ideas—change a world since we came to the Senate. This new world order we hear so much about cannot be brought about mechanically. It is not primarily a thing of pacts and agreements. It is not a question of laying out a pattern now, when no one can see the imponderables of the future.

If we are to change the world it becomes a matter of nations and people being reborn and that is a matter of getting hold of dynamic ideas which will push them over and past the limitations which bind them today. We can command the future righteously and constructively only if "we use our heads."

America can become adequate to weave a pattern of international peace and order only if she is filled with the idea of a great purpose.

We have expressed ourselves—and by "we" I mean our leaders in government—in lofty phrases and sentiments, but we must make sure that those ideas are translated into constructive action, and we must make sure that America remains doubly alert in the future in this fast-changing world, lest we prove recreant to our trust as trustees of great human values. There must be no more Pearl Harbors in our history.

I stress the need of remaining on guard and seeing to it that the Republic and its system of checks and balances remains intact. This calls for the American people to maintain a strong independent Congress.

We know that the Hitlers of the world acquired absolute power only when the legislative branch in those governments became subordinate and destroyed. In other words, no "check" remained. Under the Republic—and we are not a democracy—a strong independent Congress will always provide a check and a balance on the Executive and keep liberty and freedom safe.

A rubber-stamp Congress in time of war or of peace provides a menace to constitutional government. The safety of the Republic depends upon the heal-

thy maintenance of the constitutional system of checks and balances.

Mr. President, I repeat, we all recognize the awful power of ideas to change a world, but I should like to ask, What is being done to change the ideas of the German prisoners who are in this country? Those prisoners, when the war is over, will go back into Germany. Will we have sold them the validity of republican ideas, or will we miss that boat? Will they still be creatures of Hitler's philosophy when they get back to Germany, or will they become disciples of the American concepts?

What educational program, if any, are we putting into effect within these prison camps? The Congress of the United States has no information as to what we are doing. We are unacquainted with the facts relating to the conditions under which German prisoners are held captive within the United States. We know of no educational program relating to the welfare of those prisoners, or what is being done that they may become disciples of liberty when they return to their mother country. There are, I am informed, more than 200,000 German prisoners in this country, which fact constitutes either a potential menace to the future peace of the world, or a good influence for the future rehabilitation of their country and the world. I believe that those prisoners may be infiltrated with right ideas, and right thinking, and be converted to an appreciation of the cultural values and the great contributions that their country in the past has made to civilization. Their land has given great thinkers, great authors, great scientists, great musicians to the world—lovely things for man to live by. Goethe, Schiller, Beethoven, and a host of others have added beauty to living.

For more than a century the Germans who have emigrated to this country have made great contributions to the welfare, peace, and stability of the United States. I could mention numerous names, such as Carl Schurz, Charles Steinmetz, and others. In my own State, in every constructive field of human endeavor, the sons of Germany have made great contributions toward the American way of life.

To return these German prisoners to Germany when the war is over without at least making an effort toward their educational rehabilitation and appreciation of the aims of America in this global conflict, the great constructive ideas that Germany has given to the world, and the worthwhileness of the republican way of life, would negate our own war aims and fail to put out the fires that would make for another war.

We have read in the newspapers that the German prisoners by their conduct show absolute disrespect for American ideals, and are still Nazis at heart. I ask, What are we doing to antidote that condition? If the idea is the thing, if the condition of men's minds shapes the future, what are we doing in this situation?

We have heard much talk about re-educating the whole German Nation.

What are we doing to impact the segment in our midst? I believe that a Senate committee should be created for the purpose of making a thorough investigation of this whole subject. After the investigation has been made it should file its findings with the Senate, such findings to recommend, among other things, what educational program should be put into effect now. I am certain that from such an investigation valuable information could be obtained that would throw light upon the procedure that should be followed in Germany when the war is over.

We know that the Goering youth are already educated and being prepared mentally for the next war. If these German prisoners could go back into Germany reconverted to a keener appreciation of spiritual, human, and cultural values, and the value of democratic ideas and ideals, this might provide the very ferment that would antidote the philosophy that has been bred into this new generation of German youth.

What are we doing about it, Mr. President? Are we asleep? Are we failing to grasp this great opportunity which is now at hand?

Mr. President, if this idea meets with any approval of my associates in the Senate, I will shortly hereafter introduce a resolution to create a committee for the purpose of making such an investigation and reporting its findings to the Senate.

Mr. President, I conclude with the thought with which I started, by quoting Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes: "The thinker of today controls the future."

THIRTY-PERCENT CABARET TAX

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I send forward and ask to have read an amendment to House bill 4464, to increase the debt limit of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. —. Reduction of war-tax rate on cabarets, roof gardens, etc.

(a) Reduction of rate: Section 1650 is amended by striking out "30 percent" where it appears in the table therein as the war-tax rate on cabarets, roof gardens, etc., and inserting in lieu thereof "10 percent."

(b) Effective date: The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be applicable only with respect to the period beginning at 10 a. m. on the first day of the first month following the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, prior to April 1 there was an unprecedented demand for the entertainment afforded in cabarets throughout the country. The owners of cabarets throughout the country, contemplating a falling off in business by reason of the 30-percent tax, made inquiries with respect to interpretations of the Revenue Act of 1942, which defines a cabaret as a place furnishing public performances. These interpretations were sought not for the purpose of circumventing the law, but for the purpose of obtaining interpretations for the individual cafe owner to decide

whether his place of business with his particular type of entertainment would be subject to the new 30-percent tax.

The Revenue Act of 1942, section 622, in referring to section 1700 (e) (1), excepts instrumental or mechanical music alone from the application of the tax. In other words, any place of business described in that section that has only instrumental or mechanical music is not subject to the tax. Under the 5-percent tax, although this exception was in the law, it is safe to state that in no case was any attempt made to obtain an interpretation, and so a 5-percent tax was paid. As a result of various interpretations cabarets throughout the country advertised that up to a certain hour there would be no cabaret tax. In fact, in the city of Washington, any newspaper which contains advertisements of cabarets includes advertisements from numerous establishments prominently displaying announcements that there is no cabaret tax up to a certain hour and in certain rooms, all in accordance with the interpretations of the revenue act.

By reason of the 30-percent tax and the interpretations sought by reason of this high tax, the Government is being deprived of millions of dollars. In the city of New York alone, there are two very well-known establishments which formerly paid a 5-percent tax on their gross business, which in each case was approximately \$100,000 a month. By reason of the 30-percent tax and the exceptions set forth in the Internal Revenue Act of 1942 both these places now have only instrumental music, and the Government fails to collect the 5-percent tax formerly collected.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may make an observation?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Evidence has been referred to by the Senator from Nevada with reference to the result of the entertainment tax in New York City. Similar evidence has been presented to me by various persons in my own State, such as those engaged in the hotel and restaurant business where cabaret entertainment is furnished. The evidence shows that a great loss in revenue has been suffered by the Government, and in some instances it has been necessary to discontinue business. I have rarely received in connection with any legislation a greater number of protests than I have received with reference to the cabaret tax.

May I ask the Senator if he contemplates making an effort to reduce the tax?

Mr. McCARRAN. I have had read from the desk an amendment which I shall offer to the debt-limit bill. We had an amendment prepared to the tax simplification bill which was passed the other day. The chairman of the committee requested us not to offer the amendment to that bill, stating that he would have no objection to our offering it to the debt-limit bill which will come before the Senate later.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. So we shall all have an opportunity to register

our votes on that question when the debt-limit bill is before the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

There is no question that these places dispensed with entertainers and stopped their patrons from dancing so as to avoid the 30-percent tax and maintain their gross business at its former level, with the result that now, with instrumental music only, they are able to maintain their business, and the Government is being deprived of approximately \$10,000 a month in revenue from both of these places. It is safe to state that throughout the country there are similar instances one hundredfold.

The purpose of the revenue act and the increase in cabaret taxes to 30 percent was to obtain revenue. This highly confiscatory and discriminatory tax has proven a failure in its first month of operation. By reason of the tax numerous places throughout the country are being forced to close. Hence, the source of the revenue is lessened. Then, again, in order to avoid the tax by reason of the exception in the law, many places have already discharged their entertainers and are continuing to do so, throwing thousands of actors out of work. With the shutting down of these places and the falling off in business, not only are actors being forced out of work, but, likewise, waiters, cooks, and bartenders who are employed in these places. Many industries closely allied to the cafe industry are likewise directly suffering from the loss of business suffered by cabarets. Purveyors of foodstuffs, alcoholic beverages, supply men, costumers, repairmen, carpenters, and all industries which either supply or service the cafe industry have suffered a tremendous loss by reason of the falling off in business. It must be borne in mind that the gross business of the cafe industry throughout the country is \$600,000,000. As an example of the falling off in business, the following are the figures from the leading places in the cities of Boston and New York:

Name	Mar. 1 to 25	Apr. 1 to 25	Cocktail lounge
Latin Quarter (Boston).....	\$56,617.14	\$39,806.58	\$13,044.92
The Mayfair (Boston).....	32,240.35	17,582.88	4,949.10
El Morocco ¹			
Hurricane.....	78,754.55	50,396.67	
Versailles.....	77,374.92	56,461.69	4,737.50
Village Barn.....	30,009.10	24,575.52	
Billy Rose.....	106,878.00	68,342.00	
Leon & Eddie ²			

¹ Average loss, \$250 a day.

² March 1943, \$68,519.85; March 1944, \$80,441.20; April 1943, \$49,561.44; April 1944, \$44,254.06.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I may say that similar figures have been presented to me by the establishments named by the Senator, and I have every reason to believe that they are correct. I have also personal knowledge that very great injury has been done to these businesses. As I said before, some of them have closed and many of them will be obliged to close their doors and be wiped out of business if this tax is not repealed.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am very grateful to the Senator for his contribution. I have received many letters and much correspondence dealing with institutions and places in the Senator's State and in other States of the Union as well, which fortify the contention I am making.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. Do the figures stated by the Senator represent the loss of income to the Government or the loss to the places which are carrying on that sort of business?

Mr. McCARRAN. They represent a loss of business and of income to the institution, and, of course, a loss of revenue to the Government follows.

Mr. President, the figures I have cited represent class spots in the cities of New York and Boston. In this connection, it must be borne in mind that the city of New York is the entertainment center of the world, and we must look at conditions in the small places throughout the country which are greatly suffering by reason of this tax.

In other cities throughout the country business has taken a drop which makes it clear and evident that the purpose of the revenue act in attempting to create revenue has been defeated by its own terms, because it must be borne in mind that, with the falling off in business, the over-all tax situation is greatly affected, since the Government not only loses in admissions taxes but likewise loses with the shutting up and closing down of business additional revenue heretofore received in the form of income taxes not only from the cabarets but those industries relying on the cabarets for their income.

In the city of Chicago the leading establishments suffered as follows: Rio Cabana, business off 30 percent; Panther Room, business off 25 percent; Boulevard Room, business off 30 percent; Empire Room, business off 25 percent; Chez Paree, business off 30 percent; Marine Room, business off 25 percent; Latin Quarter, business off 30 percent.

In Hollywood, Calif., grosses in leading places fell off from 20 to 50 percent. Earl Carroll's theater restaurant, one of the leading places in Los Angeles, sustained a loss of \$1,500 a night since the inception of the 30-percent tax.

The only method for the Government to raise money in the form of taxation on admissions to cabarets is by having a fair and equitable tax. A tax of 10 percent will prevent places from closing down, prevent unemployment, be fair to members of the armed forces who frequent these places, and in the final analysis bring in to the Government the added and additional revenue originally contemplated by the Internal Revenue Act of 1943. A fair tax of 10 percent will not destroy this business and industry. If the 30-percent tax continues, the entire industry faces ruin and destruction. The conclusion from this is very clear: That the Government will never receive either the original revenue heretofore received under the 5-percent tax nor the contemplated revenue at the time of the

passage of the Internal Revenue Act of 1943, which taxed admissions in cabarets at the rate of 30 percent.

The best evidence that the industry faces ruin and prominent places and small places will close down is that the Marine Roof of Brooklyn's Hotel Bossert announced on April 29 that it was closing this room because of the 30-percent tax. This room has been a favorite for 28 years. Especially in the summertime was this room a popular dining and dancing place, because it was located on the roof of the Bossert Hotel and overlooked New York's harbor.

In my opinion, time is of the essence. Any relief must come immediately, since once these places shut down and business continues to fall off at the rate it has, it is impossible to estimate how long it will take before business reaches its plane prior to April 1.

Mr. President, the Revenue Act of 1943 with respect to admissions in roof gardens, cabarets, and so forth, by its own terms defeated its purpose by fixing the cabaret tax at 30 percent. Delay at this time in passing legislation to reduce the 30-percent tax to 10 percent will likewise defeat the purpose of relief.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4679) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Burton in the chair). The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Office of the Secretary—Salaries," on page 2, line 2, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "\$1,222,420" and insert "\$1,306,480."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Solicitor," on page 2, line 9, after the word "field", to strike out "\$224,843" and insert "\$243,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Division of Territories and Island Possessions," on page 2, line 12, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "\$115,580" and "\$155,580."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Grazing Service," on page 2, line 23, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$30,000"; in line 24, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "\$977,740" and insert "\$1,041,000", and on page 3, line 3, after the words "in all", to strike out "\$1,017,740" and insert "\$1,081,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 10, after the numerals "1934", to strike out "\$105,000" and insert "\$125,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 17, after "(52 Stat. 1033)", to strike out "\$8,000" and insert "\$9,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Petroleum Conservation Divi-

sion," on page 4, line 6, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$214,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Soil and Moisture Conservation Operations," on page 4, line 20, after the word "including", to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$105,000"; in line 25, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$4,000" and insert "\$5,000"; and on page 5, line 2, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "\$1,200,000" and insert "\$1,300,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 23, before the word "for", to strike out "\$3,000" and insert "\$10,000"; and, on page 6, line 5, after the name "Department of the Interior", to strike out "\$525,000" and insert "\$530,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 6, to insert:

Payments of wards, war minerals claims; To complete payment of awards made by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the act of May 18, 1936 (49 Stat. 1355), amending the War Minerals Relief Act of March 2, 1919, and as authorized by the act of April 4, 1944 (Public Law 284), \$54,775.82: *Provided*, That the settlement of awards under this appropriation shall be made through the General Accounting Office.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior," on page 7, line 25, after the words "provided for", to strike out "\$164,000" and insert "\$168,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 12, after the word "Department", to insert "payment of dues, when authorized by the Secretary, for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members"; and in line 16, before the word "and", to strike out "\$500" and insert "\$2,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Printing and Binding," on page 9, line 3, before the words "of which", to strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$205,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bonneville Power Administration," on page 10, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$3,686,540" and insert "\$3,940,540", and in line 9, after the name "District of Columbia", to insert a comma and "and not to exceed \$485,000 of the construction funds in said unobligated balance shall be available for the construction of the transmission line from the Grand Coulee Dam to Brewster, Wash."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands," on page 11, line 4, after the word "expenses", to strike out "\$98,160" and insert "\$115,675", and in line 5, after the word "exceeding", to strike out "\$5,200" and insert "\$10,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Office of Fishery Coordination,"

on page 12, line 8, after the name "Department of the Interior", to strike out "\$290,000" and insert "\$300,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Solid Fuels Administration for War", on page 13, line 7, after the word "services", to strike out "\$4,669,200" and insert "\$5,025,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 11, to insert:

Fuels conservation: For all necessary expenses of the Solid Fuels Administration for War in carrying out a Nation-wide program of fuel conservation, including the preparation for and dissemination of fuel conservation information by various media (including radio, and still and motion pictures to be commercially made and released); such expenses to include personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed \$100,000 for the employment of technically qualified persons or organizations, by contract or otherwise, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, or the civil-service and classification laws; printing and binding; travel expenses, including attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropriation, and actual transportation and other necessary expenses and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving, while away from their homes, in an advisory capacity without other compensation from the United States, or at \$1 per annum; books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; office supplies; furniture and equipment; purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of passenger-carrying automobiles; reimbursement at not to exceed 3 cents per mile of employees for expenses incurred by them in official travel in privately owned automobiles within the limits of their official stations; and the acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services; to be immediately available, \$700,000: *Provided*, That section 3709, Revised Statutes, shall not apply to any purchase under this appropriation when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed \$300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General Land Office," on page 15, line 3, before the word "including", to strike out "\$850,000" and insert "\$871,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 14, after the word "proceedings", to strike out "\$20,000" and insert "\$24,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 23, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$530,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 13, after the word "motorboats", to strike out "\$370,000" and insert "\$376,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 21, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "\$174,000" and insert "\$175,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 23, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "\$300,000" and insert "\$303,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 13, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "\$40,000" and insert "\$50,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 4, to insert:

Payment to Department of Forestry, Oregon, and others: For reimbursement of certain organized protection agencies in the State of Oregon for protection of unappropriated public-forest lands intermingled with Oregon and California lands, pursuant to the act of March 1, 1944 (Public Law 243), as set forth in Senate Report No. 653, Seventy-eighth Congress, \$4,852.54.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Indian Affairs—Salaries and general expenses", on page 19, line 15, after the name "District of Columbia" to strike out "\$798,175" and insert "\$828,175."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 23, after the word "available" to strike out "\$41,800" and insert "\$47,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 13, after the word "equipment", to strike out "\$315,040" and insert "\$321,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 19, after the word "therewith", to strike out "\$182,000" and insert "\$187,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Indian lands," on page 22, after line 8, insert:

Purchase of improvements on lands, Havasupai Indian Reservation, Ariz.: For the purchase of improvements on exchanged lands as authorized by and in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 4, 1944 (Public Law 246), \$11,100: *Provided*, That title to any improvements so purchased shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the Indians of the Havasupai Reservation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 6, to insert:

Purchase of land, Fort Peck Reservation, Mont. (tribal funds): For the purchase of land and improvements thereon for the Indians of the Fort Peck Reservation, Mont., \$25,000, payable from funds on deposit to the credit of the Fort Peck Indians: *Provided*, That title to any land and improvements so purchased shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the Indians of the Fort Peck Indians.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 13, to insert:

Purchase of land, Flathead Indians, Montana (tribal funds): For the purchase of land and improvements thereon for the Indians of the Flathead Reservation, Mont., \$38,000, payable from funds on deposit to the credit of said Indians: *Provided*, That title to any land and improvements so purchased shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the Indians of the Flathead Reservation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 20, to insert:

Purchase of land, Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina (tribal funds):

For the purchase of land and improvements thereon for the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina, \$2,500, payable from funds on deposit to the credit of said Indians: *Provided*, That title to any lands and improvements so purchased shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Industrial assistance and advancement," on page 24, line 13, before the word "*Provided*," to strike out "\$504,000" and insert "\$524,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 21, before the word "reimbursable", to strike out "\$170,000" and insert "\$180,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 3, after the word "equipment" to strike out "\$681,000" and insert "\$706,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 6, to insert:

For all necessary expenses of the National Indian Institute for the United States of America in the performance of its functions as prescribed by Executive order of November 1, 1941 (No. 8930), including personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase of books of reference; and printing and binding; \$22,500 of which not to exceed \$1,000 shall be available for the payment of actual transportation expenses and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses of persons serving while away from their homes without compensation from the United States in an advisory capacity to the institute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Development of water supply," no page 29, line 24, after the word "equipment", to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$108,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Irrigation and drainage," on page 30, line 10, after the word "below", to strike out "\$274,630" and insert "\$309,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 5, after the word "collections" and the semicolon, to insert "White Narrows, \$25,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 13, after the word "expenses", to strike out "\$77,460" and insert "\$86,830."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 5, after the name "Arizona", to strike out "\$118,180" and insert "\$147,725"; in line 6, after the word "and", to strike out "\$189,180" and insert "\$236,475"; in line 10, before the word "and", to strike out "\$118,180" and insert "\$147,725"; in the same line, before the word "respectively", to strike out "\$189,180" and insert "\$236,475"; and in line 13, after the words "in all", to strike out "\$307,360" and insert "\$384,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 25, after the name "Arizona", to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$11,000"; on page 33, line 1, after the word "with",

to strike out "\$38,200" and insert "\$41,600"; in line 2, after the word "and", to strike out "\$36,400" and insert "\$42,000"; in line 3, after the word "of", to strike out "\$38,200" and insert "\$41,600"; in the same line, after the word "and", to strike out "\$36,400" and insert "\$42,000"; and in line 7, after the words "in all", to strike out "\$84,600" and insert "\$94,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 3, after the word "guards", to strike out "\$35,000" and insert "\$36,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 24, after the word "binding", to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$103,750."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 25, after the words "in all", to strike out "\$356,250" and insert "\$360,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Education," on page 39, line 19, after the word "prescribe", to insert "construction"; and in line 22, after the name "Montana", to strike out "\$6,000,000" and insert "and on the Fort Apache Reservation, Ariz., \$6,230,040."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 19, after the word "than", to strike out "\$400,000" and insert "\$377,810", and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the comma and "including not to exceed \$22,190 for payment of tuition for Chippewa Indian children enrolled in public schools and care of children of school age attending private schools in the State of Minnesota, payable from the principal sum on deposit to the credit of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota arising under section 7 of the act of January 14, 1889 (25 Stat. 645)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 25, after the word "for", to strike out "\$300,000" and insert "\$340,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 10, after the word "hundred", to insert "and fifty"; in line 11, after the word "paper", to strike out "\$169,705" and insert "\$187,455", and in line 13, after the words "in all", to strike out "\$193,405" and insert "\$211,155."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$2,627,620" and insert "\$2,645,370."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, line 6, after the word "heads", to strike out "\$1,400,000" and insert "\$1,488,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General support and administration," on page 48, line 1, after the word "provisions", to strike out "\$3,202,700" and insert "\$3,283,625."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 8, after the name "United States", to strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$700,000"; in line 9, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$35,000" and insert "\$46,000"; in line 11, after the word "exceed",

to strike out "\$24,000" and insert "\$32,000"; and in line 12, before the word "and", to strike out "not to exceed \$100,000 shall be available for the rehabilitation of needy Indians."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 21, after the word "expenses", to strike out "\$75,000" and insert "\$96,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 21, after the word "expenses", to strike out "\$75,000" and insert "\$96,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 20, after the name "Cherokee", to strike out "\$8,000" and insert "\$8,500, including not to exceed a \$500 gift to the American Red Cross."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 22, after the name "Klamath", to strike out "\$216,045" and insert "\$220,070"; on page 50, line 2, after the word "and", to strike out "not to exceed \$72,380 for" and insert "to include", and in line 3, after the words "in all", to strike out "\$217,045" and insert "\$221,070."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 8, after the name "Colville", to strike out "\$8,800" and insert "\$11,300, including not to exceed \$2,500 for compensation and expenses of an attorney or attorneys employed by the tribe under a contract approved by the Secretary; and in line 21, after the words "in all", to strike out "\$34,870" and insert "\$37,370."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 22, after the name "Menominee", to strike out "\$114,400" and insert "\$118,400"; and on page 51, line 11, after the words "Indian Affairs", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That not to exceed \$10,000 shall be immediately available for an audit of the books, accounts, and operations of the Menominee Indian Mills by a certified public accountant or firm of accountants under a contract to be entered by said accountant or firm of accountants with the Menominee Tribe acting by its advisory council and approved by the Secretary of the Interior."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$544,325" and insert "\$555,350."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 2, after the word "tribes", to insert "not to exceed \$10,000 for repairs to the Choctaw Chapter House."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 21, after the word "including", to strike out "the employment of a tribal attorney who shall" and insert "the employment of a tribal attorney at the rate of \$4,500 per annum to"; and on page 54, line 2, after the word "automobiles", to strike out "\$213,700" and insert "\$173,980."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Roads and Bridges", on page 55, line 15, after the word "amended" to

strike out "\$900,000" and insert "\$1,100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Reclamation", on page 57, line 24, after the word "expenses" to strike out "\$95,000, including not to exceed \$3,500 for printing and binding" and insert "\$1,761,000, of which not to exceed \$101,000 shall be available for personal services and other expenses in the District of Columbia including not to exceed \$3,500 for printing and binding, and not to exceed \$1,660,000 shall be available for personal services and other expenses for nonproject functions of the Bureau of Reclamation performed for the Commissioner outside of the District of Columbia, the latter amount to be reimbursable under the Federal reclamation laws only to the extent of services determined by the Secretary of the Interior to be appropriately chargeable to the investigation, construction, or operation and maintenance of particular projects, said determinations to be reported by said Secretary to the Congress by January 1, 1946."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$150,000" and insert "\$200,000"; in line 20, before the word "for", to strike out "\$20,000" and insert "\$25,000"; in line 21, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$30,000"; in line 23, after the word "service", to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$7,500"; and on page 59, line 1, after the word "recordings", to strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$30,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 15, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$340,000" and insert "\$350,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 22, before the word "from", to strike out "\$385,000" and insert "\$400,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 4, after the word "maintenance", to strike out "\$99,000" and insert "\$100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$125,000" and insert "\$135,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, line 6, after the word "projects", to strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$220,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, line 10, after the name "Idaho", to strike out "\$250,000" and insert "\$200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, line 11, after the name "Oregon", to strike out "\$1,250,000" and insert "\$2,250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, line 21, after the name "Federal Power Commission", to strike out "\$400,000" and insert "\$500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$63,500" and insert "\$70,000"; and in line 5, after the word "expenses", to strike out "\$125,000" and insert "\$150,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 6, after the word "fund", to strike out "\$2,025,000" and insert "\$3,100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 8, after the word "fund", to strike out "\$3,271,000" and insert "\$6,033,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 9, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$950,000" and insert "\$968,000"; and in line 23, after the word "Secretary", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That on or before June 1, 1946, the Secretary shall report to the Congress on expenditures incurred and revenues received in the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Boulder Canyon project and other Federal activities; and that such expenditures from the Colorado River Dam fund prior to such allocation and adjustment, under this or other appropriation acts heretofore or hereafter enacted, shall be without prejudice to the rights, if any, of power contractors to have adjustments, with respect to such expenditures, made to accord with the substantive provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 19, after "(54 Stat. 708)" to strike out "\$50,000" and insert "to be immediately available, \$350,000, of which not to exceed \$100,000 may be expended for the purchase of lands subject to seepage or overflow and improvements thereon: *Provided*, That the expenditure of any moneys for the purchase of said lands and improvements or for remedial or other necessary works for the protection of public or private property, in or near the city of Needles, Calif., shall not be deemed a recognition of any obligation or liability whatsoever on the part of the United States: *Provided further*, That any moneys received by the United States as reimbursement in accordance with contracts heretofore entered into under the authority of the act of December 21, 1928 (45 Stat. 1057), as amended, and ratified by the act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1028), for work in or near said city of Needles, shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 14, after the word "system", to strike out "\$225,000" and insert "\$600,000"; in line 16, after the word "division", to strike out "\$175,000" and insert "\$1,000,000"; in line 18, after the words "in all", to strike out "\$400,000" and insert "\$1,600,000"; and in line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$8,000" and insert "\$25,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General fund, construction", at the top of page 70, to insert:

Davis Dam project, Arizona-Nevada: *Provided*, The appropriation heretofore made for this project shall be available for construction of that part of the Davis-Phoenix transmission line from the vicinity of Parker Dam to Phoenix, Ariz.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, line 15, after the name "California", to strike out "\$960,200" and insert "\$3,495,200", and in line 16, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the comma and "and in addition thereto the unexpended balance heretofore determined to be available for construction of transmission lines shall be allocated to other construction features of the project."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, after line 19, to insert:

Kings River project, California, \$750,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, line 21, after the name "Colorado", to strike out "\$1,437,000" and insert "\$1,237,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, line 23, after the name "Anderson Ranch", to strike out "\$4,300,030" and insert "\$4,040,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, after line 24, to insert:

Tucumcari project, New Mexico, \$2,250,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, line 1, after the name "Oklahoma", to strike out "\$545,000" and insert "\$945,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, line 2, after the word "division", to strike out "\$700,000" and insert "\$600,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, line 13, after the name "Federal Power Commission", to strike out "\$375,000" and insert "\$3,950,000."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Would the adoption of this amendment preclude the entry of a point of order to the paragraph at the proper time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the Senate is dealing with the House language in this paragraph, and that being already in the bill by action of the House a point of order does not lie against it at this time. If the Senator from Missouri wishes to move to strike out, he can do so.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will move to strike out at the proper time. My inquiry was whether the adoption of the amendment would preclude the motion to strike.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The adoption of the amendment would not preclude the later motion to strike out the paragraph.

Without objection, the committee amendment, on page 71, line 13, to strike out "\$375,000" and insert "\$3,950,000" is agreed to.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 71, line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$235,000" and insert "\$265,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment in line 13, on page 71, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the amendment was agreed to is reconsidered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I am opposed to the amendment because it increases the amount contained in the House bill from \$375,000 to \$3,950,000, and the purpose of the increase is perfectly disclosed by the report of the committee on page 14 where it says—

Of this increase of \$3,575,000 recommended by the committee, \$3,000,000 is allowed for continuation of investigations and for preparation for construction (other than the purchase of rights-of-way) of the Missouri Basin projects.

That simply means that this proposal is in pursuance of an attempt which is being made to extend the jurisdiction of the Reclamation Bureau all over the United States. A suggestion was made this morning in the Commerce Committee, to the absolute astonishment of every member of the committee, I think, except the one who made it, that the Reclamation Bureau ought to control the disposition of the power on the Alabama-Coosa River project in Alabama. The pending amendment would increase tenfold the authorization to the Bureau of Reclamation for roaming around and making general investigations at large. It seems to me to be entirely unjustifiable, and I do not think the Senate ought to adopt such a provision, which would permit the Reclamation Bureau simply to roam around wherever it pleases to make investigations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 71, line 13.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, as is well known to Members of the Senate, there has been controversy, to which the Senator from Missouri has referred, before the Committee on Commerce, with respect to which was the most important use of waters in the Missouri River Basin, whether to maintain a channel for navigation, or for the development of lands by irrigation on the headwaters.

The thought of our committee, when this amendment was suggested by the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], was that an ascertainment of the fact was the best way to settle the controversy. Where there is a serious difference of opinion, particularly among engineers, and the opinion is based upon a lack of sufficient data, the best way to get to the bottom of it is to find out just what are the conditions. Ultimately there is not any question at all that this whole problem will have to be looked

into, and our committee adopted the view that the sooner we make a beginning the better, particularly in view of the necessity for post-war planning.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I might add to what the Senator from Arizona has said that it was not the purpose of the committee in approving this amendment to furnish the Bureau of Reclamation or the Interior Department with funds to roam all over the United States seeking to expand the principle of irrigation. The purpose was to enable the Department of the Interior, through the Reclamation Bureau, to continue the studies involved in the Bureau of Reclamation report which has already been made a Senate document—No. 191—and that authority would be wholly under existing law, the Reclamation Act. The amendment does not increase the powers of the Bureau of Reclamation in the slightest respect, nor does it in any way, shape, or form alter the jurisdiction of the Army engineers over navigation.

I think I am rather intimately aware of the thinking of the group of Senators who have been urging an amendment to the river and harbor bill, and I may say to the Senator from Missouri that they have no thought whatsoever of taking away from the Army engineers the power over navigation. We are seeking merely to make an adjustment of uncoordinated activities of several bureaus. But, whatever may be the decision of the Commerce Committee or of the Senate with respect to that controversial item in the river and harbor bill, it certainly has no effect whatsoever upon this item, and this item has no effect upon that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, has the Senator from Wyoming concluded? If he has not concluded, I shall wait until he has concluded.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have concluded, Mr. President. I merely responded to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. With respect to the charge that the amendment would result in giving to the Reclamation Bureau the right to roam all over the country, I presume the Senator from Wyoming would not object to restricting the Bureau to points west of the ninety-seventh meridian, would he? If any Senator wanted to offer such an amendment, because some other Senator might be afraid the Reclamation Bureau would get out of bounds, I am sure the Senator from Wyoming would be satisfied if the Bureau were restricted to the areas west of the ninety-seventh meridian.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is certainly in areas west of that meridian that reclamation and irrigation are required.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. There is always a firm working arrangement between the Committees on Appropriation of the House

and the Senate and the agencies of Government which spend the money, that they will be guided by statements made in the reports, and our report states on page 14 that the item is for continuation of investigations, and refers specifically to the Missouri Basin projects designated in Senate Document 191 of the Seventy-eighth Congress. It deals with that area and those projects, and nothing else.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, of course, all Senators who have been at all familiar with the subject are aware that there has been a rather acrimonious controversy going on between those who conceive that all the water in the Missouri River should be taken out, if desirable, for irrigation purposes under control of the Bureau of Reclamation, and those of us who conceive that the resources of the Missouri Valley are also useful for other purposes, and, more particularly, between those of us who conceive that most of the work can be most effectively done, except for irrigation projects, as such, by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, and those who conceive that there should be a sort of suzerainty vested in the Secretary of the Interior, as the head, and the Bureau of Reclamation, below him, over all the resources of the country.

This item, as drawn, vests in the Secretary of the Interior the right to investigate and determine the whole subject, either by himself, through the Bureau of Reclamation or, if he happens to wish to do so—not necessarily, but if he happens to deign to do it—in cooperation with State agencies and other Federal agencies, including the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army.

Anyone who has observed the career of the present Secretary of the Interior for the past 12 years knows with what reluctance he has ever consulted with anyone, in cases in which he has had authority to act without consultation with anyone. The provision simply vests in the Secretary of the Interior, if he chooses to exercise it, control of the whole subject.

Mr. President, the provision as it was agreed to in the bill passed by the House, was vicious. It was not particularly vicious, because the sum appropriated was a sum suitable for the investigation according to the purposes set out in the report. But when the bill comes to the Senate, we find that the appropriation has been multiplied tenfold. That raises the suspicion that it is in line with the very serious attempt which is being made on the part of the Bureau of Reclamation to take control of the whole country.

The amendment seems to me to provide for an absolute waste of money, which cannot be justified on any ground whatever. It provides for an increase of approximately \$3,500,000 on an original appropriation of \$375,000—a multiplication by 10, without any particular justification, of the amount of money appropriated for this purpose. It seems to me the increase cannot be justified on any ground whatever.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee

amendment on page 71, in line 13. (Putting the question.)

The "ayes" appear to have it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division is called for.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Pending the division, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Overton
Austin	Gerry	Radcliffe
Bailey	Gillette	Reed
Ball	Green	Revercomb
Bankhead	Guffey	Reynolds
Barkley	Gurney	Robertson
Bilbo	Hatch	Russell
Brewster	Hawkes	Shipstead
Bridges	Hayden	Stewart
Brooks	Hill	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	Holman	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Tobey
Bushfield	Kilgore	Truman
Butler	La Follette	Tunnell
Byrd	Langer	Tydings
Capper	Lucas	Vandenberg
Caraway	McCarran	Wagner
Chandler	McClellan	Wallgren
Chavez	McFarland	Walsh, Mass.
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Walsh, N. J.
Connally	Maloney	Weeks
Cordon	Maybank	Wheeler
Danaher	Mead	Wherry
Davis	Millikin	White
Downey	Moore	Wiley
Eastland	Murdoch	Wilson
Ellender	O'Daniel	
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed by the President of the United States as a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference in Philadelphia, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] is absent on official business.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are detained on public business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 71, line 13.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I merely wish to reiterate what I said before the quorum call. This amendment represents an increase of tenfold, or 1,000 percent, in the appropriation contained in the House provision without any showing whatever of need or justification for such an increase. It is an increase to \$3,950,000 from an appropriation of \$375,000 as provided by the House. I understand that the Budget estimate was approximately \$800,000, which was cut almost

half a million by the House of Representatives, and now the amount is sought to be increased tenfold by the Senate committee amendment. I say that it is simply a part of the effort to aggrandize the Bureau of Reclamation and build it up at the expense of every other agency of the Government. Everyone knows that there has been a controversy going on between the proponents of tremendous expansion of irrigation and those of us who believe that there are some other uses to which water can be put.

No one denies the priority of claim of irrigation as it is now established, and within reasonable limits; but this is a proposal to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to go as far as it likes in the matter of investigation, and to establish priority for itself in the controversy with the Army engineers.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Missouri misapprehends both the purpose and effect of this amendment. On behalf of those Senators who several days ago submitted an amendment to the rivers and harbors bill the purpose of which was to bring about coordination in the planning of projects to be constructed in the future in river basins, I can say without reservation or qualification that the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of the Interior, and the authors of this amendment are perfectly willing that the Secretary of War shall have complete jurisdiction in any basin so far as navigation and flood control are concerned.

There is no purpose on the part of those Senators to extend the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation. What is true of the amendment to the rivers and harbors bill is more than true of this amendment. This money will be expended under existing law. This is an appropriation bill. It is not a legislative item. It grants no new power to the Department. It grants no new power to the Bureau of Reclamation. It grants no new power to the Secretary of the Interior. It merely provides that preliminary investigations may be made of feasible projects which, when they are constructed after the war, will make it possible for the Government of the United States to establish homes on hundreds of thousands of acres for returning soldiers.

I again assure the Senator from Missouri that he has misapprehended the entire purpose and effect of this proposed appropriation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, let me say to my distinguished friend from Wyoming that I did not misapprehend. I saw him when he drove in, which was some time ago. He has been driving very hard ever since.

The Senator from Wyoming says that I misapprehend the proposal to increase an appropriation ten fold, and put the handling of a controversy which is very active at the present time in the hands of one of the parties to the controversy, as this amendment would do. The amendment would increase by 1,000 percent the appropriation contained in the bill as passed by the House. The proposed appropriation is four times the

Budget recommendation. Let me say to the Senator from Wyoming that I do not misapprehend. I saw him when he drove in.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I cannot quite follow the Senator from Missouri. We state in our report that \$3,000,000 of this appropriation, when made, is to be expended in carrying on further investigation of the projects listed in Senate Document 191, of the Seventy-eighth Congress. That is a document which relates to projects in the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming, Kansas, and Nebraska, and they are listed in the committee hearings.

The idea is to obtain accurate and complete information as to the feasibility of those projects. They may be feasible, or they may not. Their cost may be so great that they could not be undertaken as reclamation projects. I cannot understand why ascertaining a set of facts could in any way be construed as enlarging the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior or taking anything away from the War Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 71, line 13, increasing the appropriation from \$375,000 to \$3,950,000. Before the quorum call the Chair put the question and announced that the ayes seemed to have it. The Senator from Missouri then requested a division. Does the request still stand?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes, Mr. President; I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 71, line 22, after the word "expenses", to strike out "\$325,000" and insert "\$375,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, line 23, after the word "construction", to strike out "\$8,642,200" and insert "\$17,642,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Water conservation and utilization projects," on page 72, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$120,000" and insert "\$220,000"; in line 6, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$22,500" and insert "\$25,000"; in line 9 after "(16 U. S. C. 590y, 590z)", to strike out "\$1,400,000" and insert "\$2,000,000", and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That any funds appropriated to and unexpended by the Department of Agriculture for carrying out functions assigned to the Secretary of Agriculture by the act of August 11, 1939, as amended, are hereby transferred to the Department of the Interior together with the functions which the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to perform."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, after line 15, to insert:

Fort Peck project, Montana: For construction of transmission lines, substations and other facilities as may be required by the Bureau of Reclamation, as authorized by the act of May 18, 1938 (16 U. S. C. 833), \$800,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, which amount shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia (not to exceed \$12,000) and for all other objects of expenditure as specified in this act under the head "Administrative provisions and limitations" appearing under the caption "Bureau of Reclamation," but without regard to the amounts of the limitations therein set forth.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Geological Survey," on page 73, line 24, before the word "of", to strike out "\$1,180,360" and insert "\$1,250,000"; and in the same line, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$300,000" and insert "\$325,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, line 21, after the name "Alaska", to strike out "\$177,000" and insert "\$1,252,000"; and in line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$60,000" and insert "\$150,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 2, after the word "binding", to strike out "\$87,500" and insert "\$100,000"; in line 3, before the word "and" where it occurs the first time to strike out "\$27,840" and insert "\$33,000", and in line 4, after the words "in all" to strike out "\$350,340" and insert "\$368,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, line 15, after the name "Geological Survey", to strike out "\$6,658,160" and insert "\$7,820,460."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Mines," on page 78, line 16, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "\$772,595" and insert "\$822,595."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 78, line 24, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$80,000" and insert "\$117,000"; on page 79, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$3,500" and insert "\$70,000" and in line 12, after the word "industry", to strike out "\$936,270" and insert "\$1,527,880."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 79, line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$116,500" and insert "\$120,000", and on page 80, line 6, after the name "Department of the Interior", to strike out "\$575,000" and insert "\$600,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 80, line 23, before the word "for", to strike out "\$22,500" and insert "\$25,000" and on page 81, line 9, after the name "Department of the Interior", to strike out "\$250,000" and insert "\$300,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, after line 22, to insert:

Anthracite investigations: For all expenses necessary to conduct inquiries and scientific

and technologic investigations concerning the mining, preparation, treatment, and use of anthracite coals; including temporary employment by contract or otherwise, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, of engineers, scientists, architects, or firms or corporations thereof necessary to design and construct the building and plants; purchase of special wearing apparel and equipment for the protection of employees while engaged in their work; and other items otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriation "Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior," purchase not to exceed \$4,500, operation, maintenance, and repair of passenger-carrying automobiles; and not to exceed \$6,500 for personal services in the District of Columbia, \$131,000: *Provided*, That of this amount \$50,000 shall be available for the purchase of land and the construction and equipment of a laboratory building as authorized in the act approved December 18, 1942 (Public Law 812, 56 Stat. 1056), only upon the fulfillment of the condition that an equal amount shall be contributed for the same purpose by State or local organizations: *Provided further*, That the Secretary, through the Director of the Bureau of Mines, is authorized to accept buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public or private sources.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, after line 22, to insert:

Synthetic liquid fuels: For all expenses without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, necessary to carry into effect the act authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shales, agricultural and forestry products, and so forth, approved April 5, 1944 (Public, No. 290), including construction and acquirement of camp and laboratory buildings and equipment, personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, purchase of books of reference and periodicals, purchase of special wearing apparel or equipment for the protection of employees while engaged in their work, purchase, maintenance, and operation of passenger-carrying automobiles, printing and binding, and purchase in the District of Columbia and elsewhere of items otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriation "Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior," \$8,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That these funds may be utilized to provide transportation between the proposed plants and related facilities and communities that provide adequate living accommodations, of persons engaged in the operation and maintenance of these plants; and for transportation to and from schools of pupils who are dependents of such persons, which transportation shall be by methods which the Office of Defense Transportation shall find to be most advantageous and efficient: *Provided further*, That pursuant to agreements approved by the Secretary and the Office of Defense Transportation, the transportation equipment available to the Bureau of Mines may be pooled with that of school districts and other local or Federal agencies for use in transporting persons engaged in operation and maintenance of these plants, pupils who are dependents of such persons, and other pupils, and in the interest of economy the expenses of operating such equipment may be shared.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 84, line 16, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$35,000" and insert "\$36,000"; and in line 17, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "\$435,000" and insert "\$440,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, line 3, before the words "of which", to strike out "\$600,000" and insert "\$1,187,640"; and in the same line, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$48,500" and insert "\$55,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, line 13, before the words "of which", to strike out "\$762,000" and insert "\$772,000"; and in the same line, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$24,400" and insert "\$25,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, line 22, after the word "improvements", to strike out "\$160,000" and insert "\$168,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 86, line 12, after the word "foregoing", to strike out "\$575,000" and insert "\$590,750"; and in line 13, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$452,000" and insert "\$464,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 86, after line 14, to insert:

Investigation of raw-material resources for steel production (national defense): For all expenses, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, necessary to enable the Bureau of Mines to develop individual deposits of minerals useful in the steel industry the existence of which is known, and concerning which preliminary geological or other reports are available from State mineral agencies, previous investigations of the Bureau of Mines, or other sources; to conduct geophysical surveys, surface and subsurface exploration on such deposits; to conduct laboratory, pilot plant, and demonstration-plant tests to establish methods for utilizing more fully the products of such deposits; including the purchase or lease of land or buildings; mineralogical explorations for and development of sources of ferrous, nonferrous, or nonmetallic minerals useful in alloying or coating by plating or otherwise of iron and steel to reduce or eliminate corrosion, and the research and development of commercial processes therefor; construction of buildings to house laboratories, pilot plants, or demonstration plants; procurement of necessary materials, ores, and equipment; travel expenses; purchase, not to exceed \$75,000, operation, maintenance, and repair of passenger-carrying automobiles; not to exceed \$150,000 for temporary employment of engineers, architects, or firms or corporations thereof, by contract or otherwise, without regard to civil-service and classification laws, necessary to carry out the provisions of this appropriation; printing and binding; purchase in the District of Columbia or elsewhere of furniture and equipment, books of reference and periodicals, and purchase of special wearing apparel or equipment for the protection of employees while engaged in their work; purchase in the District of Columbia and elsewhere of other items otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriation "Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior"; and not to exceed \$120,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, \$6,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Mines, is hereby authorized to accept buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public or private sources and to carry out the projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, or private.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I wish to offer a clarifying amendment on page 87, line 11, after the word "to", to insert "exceed", so that the language will

read "not to exceed \$150,000," and so forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 93, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$75,000" and insert "\$78,000"; and on page 94, line 3, after the word "employed", to strike out "\$2,900,000" and insert "\$3,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 94, after line 8, to insert:

Development of processes for recovery of waste metals (national defense): The appropriation under this head in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944, is hereby made available for the same purposes and under the same conditions until June 30, 1945.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Park Service", on page 97, line 5, after the word "system", to strike out "\$407,165" and insert "\$413,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 97, line 16, after the word "system", to strike out "\$24,000" and insert "\$25,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 99, line 10, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "\$171,820" and insert "\$199,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 99, line 20, after the word "Monument", to strike out "\$441,000" and insert "\$460,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 102, line 20, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "\$133,000" and insert "\$158,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Fish and Wildlife Service—Salaries and expenses", on page 104, line 2, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "\$196,100" and insert "\$206,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 104, line 9, after the word "aquarium", to strike out "\$1,097,555" and insert "\$1,115,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 104, line 25, after the word "stations", to strike out "\$547,265" and insert "\$562,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 105, line 8, after the word "services", to strike out "\$277,540" and insert "\$342,540."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 105, line 13, after the word "products", to strike out "\$92,420" and insert "\$99,260."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 106, line 3, after the word "fur", to strike out "\$126,150" and insert "\$133,450."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 106, line 7, after the word "including", to strike out "\$38,500" and insert "\$40,130", and in line 15, after the name "Territory of Alaska", to strike out "\$193,715" and insert "\$243,715."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 107, line 3, after "(16 U. S. C. 667)", to strike out "\$815,000" and insert "\$1,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 107, line 17, before the words "of which", to strike out "\$322,400" and insert "\$347,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 107, line 24, after "(U. S. C. 192-211)", to strike out "\$150,000" and insert "\$156,530."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 108, line 11, after the word "Refuge" to strike out the comma and "\$590,675" and insert a semicolon and "and not to exceed \$36,000 for the purchase of approximately 6,000 acres of land in Humboldt County, Nev., as an addition to the Charles Sheldon Antelope Range, \$666,675, and in addition thereto \$40,000 of the unexpended balance for this purpose for the fiscal year 1944 is continued available for the same purpose for the fiscal year 1945."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 108, line 20, after "715-715r)" to strike out "\$58,330" and insert "\$63,330."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 108, line 21, after the word "expenses" to strike out "\$5,028,350" and insert "\$5,498,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal aid in wildlife restoration", on page 109, line 8, after "669-669j)", to strike out "\$800,000" and insert "\$1,300,000", and in line 11, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That the limitation in said act upon the amount available for administrative expenses is hereby waived to the extent necessary to provide for overtime or additional compensation pursuant to the War Overtime Pay Act of 1943."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 109, line 16, after the word "Service", to strike out "\$5,828,350" and insert "\$3,798,300"; in line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$784,000" and insert "\$854,348"; in line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$30,000" and insert "\$42,700"; in line 22, after the words "for the", to strike out "purchase" and insert "exchange"; and on page 110, line 14, after the word "land", to insert:

Reimbursements for the cost of supplies and materials and the transportation and handling thereof issued from central warehouses authorized to be established by the act of June 24, 1936 (16 U. S. C. 667), may be credited to the appropriation current at the time supplies and materials are allotted, assigned, or issued, or at the time such reimbursements are received.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Government in the Territories—Territory of Alaska," on page 112, line 23, after "321a-321c)", to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$1,180,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 113, line 1, after the name "Alaska", to strike out "\$1,000,000 and insert "\$1,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, on pages 112 and 113 of the bill reference is made to Richardson Highway. Will the chairman of the committee, or the Senator having charge of the bill, tell me what is the Richardson Highway?

Mr. HAYDEN. Richardson Highway is the terminal section of the Alaskan Military Highway which has been under construction for some time. The estimated cost of the Richardson Highway is \$6,200,000, and appropriations are made from year to year to carry on the work.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is the item of \$1,500,000 in line 1 on page 113 included in the approximately \$6,000,000 to which the Senator has referred?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; that will be the total cost. The highway is all in Alaska. It is the terminal section inside of Alaska.

Mr. REVERCOMB. But the amount indicated is a part of the original sum which was set aside for the entire development?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. And the part to be expended under this appropriation is for the road within Alaska?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Territory of Hawaii," on page 114, line 21, after the name "Governor", to strike out "\$3,100" and insert "\$3,875"; in line 22, before the word "for", to strike out "750" and insert "935", and in the same line after the word "hire", to strike out "\$21,600" and insert "\$22,560."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Government of the Virgin Islands," on page 115, line 15, after the name "St. Croix", to strike out "\$208,375" and insert "\$216,000, to be expended under the direction of the Governor."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 115, after line 16, to insert:

For salaries and expenses of the agricultural experiment station and the vocational school in the Virgin Islands, including technical personnel, clerks, and other persons; scientific investigations of plants and plant industries, and diseases of animals; demonstrations in practical farming; official traveling expenses; fixtures, apparatus, and supplies; clearing and fencing of land; and other necessary expenses, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, \$47,260.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 116, line 4, before the words "to be", to strike out "\$70,000" and insert "\$140,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Puerto Rico," on page 119, after line 2, to strike out:

Sec. 8. Not to exceed a total of \$25,000 of the appropriations contained in this act shall be available for expenditure for long-distance telephone tolls, and not to exceed a total of \$25,000 shall be available for expenditure for telegrams and cablegrams, and the savings effected thereby in the items "communication services," as set forth in the Budget estimates submitted for such appropriations shall not be diverted to other use and shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 119, line 12, to change the section number from "9" to "8."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 120, to insert the following new section:

Sec. 9. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used directly or indirectly by way of wages, salaries, per diem or otherwise, for the performance of any new administrative function or the enforcement or issuance of any rule or regulation occasioned by the establishment of the Jackson Hole National Monument as described in Executive Proclamation No. 2578, dated March 15, 1943.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 120, after line 10, to strike out:

Sec. 11. No part of the money appropriated in this act shall be used to pay the salary of any male person between the ages of 18 and 30 years who is physically and mentally qualified for military duty, as shown by his Selective Service classification, and who has been deferred from military duty, either at his own request or the request of the Secretary of the Interior, for reasons other than dependency or as necessary to war production, and who, 30 days after the approval of this act, still retains such deferment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by direction of the committee I offer an amendment which was intended to be proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. It relates to the fulfillment of the Atoka agreement with Choctaw-Chickasaw Nations of Indians. Twice the Senate has passed a bill of this nature. The amendment imposes immediately no obligation on the United States. It authorizes negotiation. When an agreement has been reached it must come back to the Congress for further approval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 55, after line 4, it is proposed to insert the following:

Fulfillment of Atoka agreement with Choctaw-Chickasaw Nation of Indians: That pursuant to the provisions of the treaty between the United States and the Choctaw-Chickasaw Nations of Indians, known as the Atoka agreement, and the supplemental agreements thereafter made and the laws enacted by the Congress, the Secretary of the Interior is

hereby authorized and directed to enter into a contract on behalf of the United States for the purchase from the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians in Oklahoma for all the present right, title, and interest of said Indians in the land and mineral deposits reserved from allotment in accordance with the provisions of section 58 of the act entitled "An act to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes of Indians, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902. The Secretary shall cause such contract to be executed on behalf of said Indians by the principal chief of the Choctaw Nation and the governor of the Chickasaw Nation, and shall then submit such contract to said Indians for their approval. If and when such contract has been approved by said Indians, the Secretary shall submit the contract to the Congress for its ratification: *Provided*, That the approval of such contract by the said Indians shall be through a special election called and held pursuant to rules and regulations to be promulgated by the said Secretary of the Interior: *And provided further*, That before the said rules and regulations are promulgated they must be submitted to and approved by both the principal chief of the Choctaw Nation and the governor of the Chickasaw Nation. Such contract shall not be binding upon any of the parties thereto until it shall have been ratified by the Congress.

Upon the approval of such contract by the Congress—

(a) The amount of the purchase price fixed in such contract when appropriated shall be placed to the credit of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians on the books of the Treasury of the United States, and thereafter such proceeds shall be distributed to such Indians in pursuance with the terms and provisions of such contract and shall be exempted from attorney fees and other debt contracted prior to the passage and approval of this act; and

(b) The Secretary shall cause a proper conveyance to be executed by the principal chief of the Choctaw Nation and the governor of the Chickasaw Nation conveying all right, title, and interest of said Indians in such lands and mineral deposits to the United States, and thereupon, all such right, title, and interest shall vest in the United States.

The appropriation of such sum as may be necessary for making the payments to such Indians pursuant to section 2 (a) of this act is hereby authorized. There is also authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$20,000 to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, to defray the expenses of negotiating the contract and holding of the election authorized by section 1 hereof, including the making of such appraisal or appraisals as may be deemed necessary.

The land and mineral deposits when acquired hereunder shall become part of the public domain subject to the applicable public land mining and mineral leasing laws, the coal deposits acquired hereunder may be leased in accordance with the provisions relating to coal of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), as amended. The asphalt deposits acquired hereunder may be leased by the Secretary of the Interior through advertisement, competitive bidding, or such other methods as he may by general regulations prescribe, and in areas not exceeding 640 acres each. Leases for such asphalt deposits shall be conditioned upon the payment by the lessee of such royalty as may be fixed in the lease, not less than 25 cents per ton of 2,000 pounds of marketable production, and upon payment in advance of a rental 25 cents per acre for the first calendar year or fraction thereof; 50 cents per acre for the second, third, fourth, and fifth years,

respectively; and \$1 per acre per annum thereafter during the continuance of the lease, such rental for any lease year to be credited against royalties accruing for that year. Leases for such asphalt deposits shall be for a period of 20 years, with preferential right in the lessee to renew the same for successive periods of 10 years upon such reasonable terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, unless otherwise provided by law at the expiration of such periods. All asphalt leases issued hereunder shall be subject to such further terms and conditions, not inconsistent herewith, as may be incorporated in each lease or prescribed by general regulations adopted by the Secretary of the Interior prior to the issuance of the lease, including covenants relative to mining methods, waste, period of preliminary development, initial investment, and minimum production. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to modify or amend as to area any asphalt lease issued hereunder upon application of the lessee if he finds such modification or amendment to be to the best interests of the United States and of the lessee. The general provisions of sections 1, 27, 29, to 34, inclusive, 37, and 38 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), as amended, shall apply to asphalt leases issued under the provisions of this act, sections 1, 34, and 37 thereof being amended to include deposits of asphalt acquired hereunder, and section 27 thereof being amended to provide that no person, associate, or corporation shall take or hold more than 2,560 acres under asphalt lease at any one time. The entire net income from coal and asphalt leases issued under this act shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, as a matter of information, may I inquire what is the character of the minerals in this land which is to be conveyed to the United States?

Mr. HAYDEN. There are asphalt deposits, oil deposits, and other minerals in the land. As the Senator very well knows, Oklahoma is a great petroleum-producing State and there are deposits of the type referred to there. The idea is to try to clean up the remnant that is left of this area, pass title to it to the United States, and to have it operated under the Mineral Leasing Act. The point is that this authorizes the negotiation of an agreement to that effect, which must come back to Congress for approval. There has been a disagreement between the Indian tribes and the Government of long standing.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Do the Indians own the minerals at this time?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; they have title to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona on behalf of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, if it is in order, I should like to request that the Senate revert to page 49, line 22.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me there are two committee amendments the Senator from Wyoming was authorized, by the committee, to offer. It will not take long to dispose of them.

Mr. HOLMAN. Very well, I will withdraw my request if the Senator in charge of the bill will prompt me at the proper

time when I may offer the amendment I have in mind.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Shoshone and Arapaho Indians on the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming recently adopted a resolution indicating their desire to expend not to exceed \$7,500 of the tribal funds, to pay a per diem compensation to the members attending council meetings, to pay a per diem compensation of \$10 to the delegates who may be required to go to Washington or to Chicago for conferences with the Indian Office, and to pay compensation for certain Indian game and fish wardens on the reservation. The amendment has the approval of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and also the unanimous approval of the Committee on Appropriations. By authority of the committee, therefore, I offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 50, after line 3, it is proposed to insert the following:

Expenses of tribal officers and other purposes, Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes, Wyoming (tribal funds): For the current fiscal year the Secretary of the Interior, or such official as may be designated by him, is hereby authorized to pay out of any joint tribal funds of the Shoshone and Arapaho Indians of the Wind River Reservation, Wyo., in the Treasury of the United States the following salaries and expenses:

To the chairman, secretary, and interpreter of the Shoshone and Arapaho Joint General Council and members of the Shoshone and Arapaho Joint Business Committee, or other committees appointed by the Joint General Council, when engaged on joint business of the tribes, a sum of not to exceed \$8 per diem for attendance to cover salary and all expenses; to such official delegates of the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes who may carry on the joint business of the tribes in Washington or Chicago a per diem of not to exceed \$10 in lieu of salary and expenses: *Provided*, That the rate per diem shall be fixed in advance by the Joint General Council or by the Joint Business Committee if authorized by said Joint General Council: *Provided further*, That the official delegates of said tribes carrying on business in Washington or Chicago shall also receive the usual railroad and sleeping-car transportation to and from Washington or Chicago: *And provided further*, That the length of stay of the official delegates in Washington or Chicago shall be determined by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. The Secretary or his designate is also authorized and directed to expend from said joint tribal funds of the Shoshone and Arapaho Indians with the consent of the Joint Business Committee, not exceeding \$1,500 per annum for pay of game and fish wardens to be appointed by the Joint Business Committee, for patrolling the lakes, streams, and hunting areas of the Wind River Reservation: *Provided*, That receipts derived from fishing and hunting licenses and permits and from fines shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the tribes pursuant to the provisions of the act of May 17, 1926 (44 Stat. 560): *Provided further*, That all the aforesaid pay and expenses for all purposes shall not exceed, in the aggregate, \$7,500 per annum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, during the past several months Congress has been considering the problem of the manufacture of synthetic fuels. A law was enacted authorizing the appropriation of not to exceed \$30,000,000 to carry out the program for the construction of demonstration plants. The Appropriations Committee has approved and the Senate has already approved this afternoon an appropriation of \$8,000,000. I am authorized to offer a legislative amendment authorizing the department to make contractual obligations for the remaining \$22,000,000.

The purpose of the amendment is to enable the Department to carry into effect the program as a whole. If it were not given this authority, it would be hampered in preparing plans for carrying on the work. The law contemplates a 5-year program. An appropriation is made for a million dollars, which is the amount that may be expended during the next fiscal year, and the authorization, if granted, will enable the program to be carried out.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. Are there any limitations as to the area in which this fund may be expended?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The law as passed, as I recall, did not have any limitations as to area.

Mr. OVERTON. I was interested because there are a number of places in the South where I should like to see such plants established.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Alabama, a member of the committee, spoke of the desirability of that which the Senator from Louisiana suggests during a committee hearing at which the Senator from Louisiana was unable to be present because of the rivers and harbors' bill, which was been occupying so much of his time.

Mr. OVERTON. I understand the Senator from Alabama referred to it in the committee, and I regret I was not able to be present.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no limitation in the law.

Mr. OVERTON. I understood there was something that would prohibit the doing of what I have in mind, or that perhaps the funds had already been allocated for certain areas, and that there would be none available for the South, Louisiana in particular.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There has been no allocation of the funds.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming on behalf of the committee.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill, under the heading "Bureau of Mines," it is proposed to insert the following: "*Provided further*, That in addition to the amount herein appropriated the Secretary of the Interior is

hereby authorized to enter into contracts for additional work not exceeding a total of \$22,000,000 during the period covered by the aforesaid act, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof and appropriations hereafter made for the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels shall be considered available for the purpose of discharging the obligations so created."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, that I think concludes the committee amendments, and the Senator from Oregon may now take up the matter to which he referred a few moments ago.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I request the Senate to advert to page 49, line 22, and at that point I move to strike out the figures "\$220,070" and insert in lieu thereof the figures and words: "\$223,670, of which not to exceed \$1,200 shall be available until expended in units of \$300 for standing rewards for information leading to the apprehension and conviction for the theft or killing of any Indian cattle (tribal or individual) on the Klamath Reservation, of any person or persons, under rules and regulations adopted by the Klamath Cattle Committee and approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and."

Mr. President, in justification of the proposed amendment, I may say that its effect would be to appropriate an additional \$3,600 of Klamath tribal funds, of which \$1,200 would be available for use in units of \$300 for the payment of rewards for information leading to the apprehension and conviction for the theft or killing of Indian cattle on the Klamath Reservation; and \$2,400 would be available for the tribe to engage a dentist to take care of the teeth of members of the tribe, in particular, children.

These are very small items, but they are of great importance to the tribe.

Mr. HAYDEN. I notice that the Senator's amendment provides that the funds shall not be expended unless approved by the tribal council.

The matter came to the attention of the committee after we had made up the bill; otherwise, it would probably have been included. Under the circumstances, I shall be glad to accept the amendment and take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Before the amendment may be entertained it will be necessary to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment on page 49, line 22, was agreed to.

Mr. HOLMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment at that place be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendment is reconsidered.

The question now is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr.

HOLMAN] to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be offered the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 4679) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in view of the fact that it is desirable to secure final action on the appropriation bill as soon as possible, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. NYE, Mr. HOLMAN, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. BURTON conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask unanimous consent that the clerk be authorized to correct all totals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

The Chair hears none, and the clerk is authorized to correct all totals in the bill.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURTON in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the appropriate committee.

(For nomination this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is no Executive Calendar, so I shall not move an executive session. It is my purpose to move a recess until Thursday, on which day I hope we may have a call of the calendar. So far as I know, there will be no other business of any importance on that day, unless an appropriation bill shall be ready for consideration, and I do not think any will be.

I move that the Senate take a recess until Thursday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, May 25, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 23 (legislative day of May 9), 1944:

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Worrall R. Carter, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Commander, Service Squadron 10.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 23, 1944

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Christ, Thou who didst stand for the poor, the friendless, and the enslaved and hast given the world a genuine measurement of the value of man, in Thy name we pray. As Thou art the solvent of our rising critical problem, teach us to follow Thee and thus avoid attendant intolerance and hatred with their tangled and puzzled relationships. We praise Thee; Thou didst leave nothing Thou didst not touch, and touched nothing Thou didst not adorn.

Heavenly Father, who girdest the souls of men and women, make Thyself felt in the great crisis of our conflict that we may never become its victims, dwarfed by our weakness or desire for material gain. Give us a genuine infusion of unity and cooperation that will make us tread bravely toward the prime essentials in the life and character of our Republic. Sustain us with an unshaken faith and with a valliant, unbroken hope, lifting us above the selfishness of man and the throes of self-complacency which chill and stiffen the cause of our liberation. Hear the cries and prayers which are arising along the ways of our tortured humanity. In the name of Him who made the eternal sacrifice. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ACTING CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 22, 1944.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Desiring to be temporarily absent from my office, I hereby designate Mr. H. Newlin Megill, an official in my office, to sign any and all papers and do all other acts for me which he would be authorized to do by virtue of this designation and of clause 4, rule III, of the House.

Respectfully yours,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

COLORADO PROPOSES REGULATIONS FOR INTERSTATE AIR CARRIERS

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BULWINKLE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include